

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

November 17, 2010

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, November 17, 2010, was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Chairman Gordon Howard in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the County Administrative Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Howard, Fields, Rhodes, Hazard, Mitchell, Kirkman and Hiron

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Smith, Stinnette, Zuraf, Bullington, Hess and Hornung

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Howard: Are there any declarations of disqualification from any of the Commissioners? Hearing none, before we move into the unfinished business, recognizing there's quite a bit on our agenda this evening, is there an appetite by the Commission to move what we can into the first hour? I do know we have item 1 on the agenda which was referred to today. That could very well take up the hour but is there an appetite to remove the remaining items, which essentially would only be the Director's Report, County Attorney's Report, Committee Reports, Chairman's Report and any other business that comes up, because everything else is deferred and has a different timeline.

Mr. Fields: Certainly. I mean, I'm fine with it.

Mr. Howard: Okay, so we're in full agreement on that? Okay. Alright, we'll move to item 1 which was an item that was deferred from the last meeting and it's the discussion of Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion of Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements (SSAR) - Repeal of Street Access Requirements (**Time Limit: January 17, 2011**) (**Deferred at November 3, 2010 Meeting to November 17, 2010 Meeting**)

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Hornung will be discussing this item with the Commission.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mrs. Hornung: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. In your packet will be about six or seven examples of subdivisions that were previously approved in the last two years, meaning the latter part of '08 to the present, and how they rate in relation to the definition of connectivity under the SSAR. This ordinance that's before you is to repeal the County's SSAR so that there would be no conflict with the new state code regulations. And, basically, for connectivity, which is what the subdivisions were compared to was the definition of connectivity which is the number of street segments divided by the number of intersections, and all of them except one does not meet the SSAR if they were to be before you today and be approved today. But since they've already been approved, you can see how they don't meet. And by approving the repealing this section, that will make sure that there is no conflict with the County's regulations in the state code. And also, if the County didn't then we wouldn't meet the state code regulations. In, well for example, one of the

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Hampton Run, which is one of the subdivisions, you can see that the blue designations are the intersections and the orange designations are the street segments and that's how we came up with the ratio 5/4 and 125. And because Stafford County is designated as suburban, the connectivity requirements would have to equal... be greater than or equal to 1.4. So, all of these do not meet it except for Cranewood Section 2.

Mr. Fields: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question? I was noticing on these slides here that it said developments approved after July 1, 2009 must meet those requirements.

Mrs. Hornung: Correct.

Mr. Fields: So these were all approved before that date?

Mrs. Hornung: Yes and no. The reason for that is that prior to July 1, '09, a lot of these had already been under review and so VDOT allowed them to come under the former SSR regulations. There was the... before July 1, 2009, there was the option of would you like to meet the new SSAR that will be required after July 1 or would you like to stay with SSR. And because a lot of these were already under design and had been approved, whether it was through a few years or even a month ahead of time, they were already accepted under the SSR and they weren't going to be asked to change.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Howard: Yes Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: Can I get some further clarification on that?

Mr. Howard: Sure.

Ms. Kirkman: From staff. So, are you saying that VDOT said despite what the State Legislation says about the implementation date, if a subdivision plan was approved after July 1, 2009 it did not have to meet these requirements?

Mrs. Hornung: Correct. If you see, these AP numbers, a lot of Cranewood was submitted in 2004, Hampton Run 2005, Ruby Meadows, Sycamore 2007, Fair Havens, Lexington Farms 2008 and Southgate Hills in 2009. But because at the time when they were submitted they allowed those to come under the former SSR regulations. They had the option but after July 1, anything submitted after July 1 had to meet.

Ms. Kirkman: But the language you read to us didn't say submitted, it said approved. And a number of these were approved after July 1, 2009. Do we have anything in writing from VDOT or from the Attorney General or someone that interprets the statute to say that it's okay to approve these after July 1, 2009 if they don't meet the regulations?

Mrs. Hornung: I have not received anything in writing to say that. But in conversations with VDOT, they said if anything was submitted prior to July 1, 2009 when the requirement was affective, that they had the option of the SSR or SSAR regulations.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Is there anything in the statute or the administrative rules or in the policy guidance that states that?

Mrs. Hornung: I would have to check on that, unless Mr. Smith is aware of anything of that nature.

Mr. Smith: No, Ms. Kirkman, I'm not aware of anything.

Ms. Kirkman: Could we get that further looked into because I'd hate to think a lot of these subdivision plans were approved in violation of the VDOT regulations.

Mrs. Hornung: I'm... okay.

Mr. Howard: So, Ms. Kirkman, if I understand you right, you're asking for clarification from either VDOT or some other state...

Ms. Kirkman: I'm asking for a citation of either the administrative rules, the policy guidance or the statute itself that states it is okay to approve after July 1, 2009, a subdivision plan that does not meet these secondary requirements.

Mr. Howard: So, you're looking for the definition on that interpretation from somebody other than staff of Stafford County.

Ms. Kirkman: I'm looking for some kind of official guidance, whether it's in the administrative rules, the statute or some policy guidance.

Mr. Howard: Got it. Okay, are you finished Mrs. Hornung?

Mrs. Hornung: Yes sir.

Mr. Howard: Okay, let me just see if there's any other questions from any Commissioners. Are there any other questions from any of the other Commissioners on this item?

Ms. Kirkman: No, the examples you gave were very helpful, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Mrs. Hornung: And I only gave you a portion of the VDOT power point. There's more to that but it was very extensive. But we're dealing with connectivity.

Mr. Howard: Right. Was there anything in there that you recall that's pertinent to Ms. Kirkman's question? So, did they have an clarifying language in their presentation that they explain how they had the authority to allow...?

Mrs. Hornung: I don't recall that. I'd have to go back and check, now that I have that particular question.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Alright, we deferred this at the last meeting to this meeting. We have until January 17th. There's certainly more time.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Chairman, that date is for you to conduct your public hearing and also make a recommendation.

Mr. Howard: So we would essentially have to act on this at the next meeting?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, in order to get it to a public hearing in the first part of January.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Is there a motion to defer to the next meeting?

Mrs. Hornung: Excuse me...

Ms. Kirkman: No... Mr. Chair, the question I have was actually not in reference to the pending legislation but in reference to the recommendations of staff and the prior actions regarding subdivision plans. So I don't think that, in any way, needs to hold this process up. And, with that in mind, I would make a motion to go ahead and send this to public hearing.

Mr. Howard: Is there a second?

Mr. Fields: Second.

Mr. Howard: Any discussion? Hearing no discussion, I will call for the vote. All those in favor of Ms. Kirkman's motion which is moving forward the Secondary Street Acceptance Requirements to public hearing signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed nay? The motion carries 7-0. Thank you Mrs. Hornung.

Mrs. Hornung: Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Okay, the next item since we changed our agenda slightly is Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The Board of Supervisors had a busy day yesterday. There are four items I want to report to you with regard to some of their actions. Yesterday the Board initiated an application to amend a Conditional Use Permit for Living Hope Lutheran Church. The church has a condition that requires a wooden fence to be installed surrounding a play area for a

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

daycare center. The fence that was installed was a vinyl fence; it does not comply with the conditions of the permit and the Board of Supervisors felt it necessary for them to initiate the process to make a minor amendment to the CUP. So, we'll be working on putting that application together and sending it forward to you all for public hearing. The Board had their public hearings on the Fairfield Inn and Suites Comp Plan Amendment, Rezoning, as well as Conditional Use Permit. They deferred action until their meeting on December 14th. Some of the Board members expressed a desire to go back out and look at the property and potentially request the applicant to do a balloon test or something else similar to that so they could get a better view of the elevation of the hotel in relation to the line of site along the street. The Board also held a public hearing on Stafford Lakes Service Center. There was a lot of discussion about dedication of the right-of-way. That led the Board to continue its public hearing; its public hearing has been continued to the afternoon of December 14th. And then, finally, they approved the Conditional Use Permit Amendment for AT&T Mobility to allow the second communication tower on Mountain Avenue in the George Washington District. And that concludes my report.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Harvey. County Attorney's Report?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Mr. Smith: No report, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Smith. I would point out, for those of you watching and those of you in the audience, we do have Mr. Pat Taves with us who is an attorney himself and the County has used Mr. Taves from time to time; and, in particular, with help on the Comprehensive Plan which is part of the public hearing... or is the only item on the public hearing this evening. So, you'll see Mr. Taves on the dais here with us and he will work closely with Mr. Smith during tonight's public hearing on the amendment to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan. And he's been working with us on this plan for... Mr. Taves, for how long?

Mr. Taves: About three or four months.

Mr. Howard: Three or four months he's been working with us. Chairman's Report?

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Howard: I have a quick report. The first report I've had I think as the Chairman; but if we could go to the computer real quick. And I thought I'd be doing this at the end of the night but I'm not. So, how did we get here with the Comp Plan, right? So, it's really a compilation of over four and a half years' worth of work. The last twelve months we basically had changes on the UDA legislation that was incorporated into the plan, the Comp Plan Steering Committee held Thursday night meetings for about four months focusing on the policy sections. The Joint Board of Supervisors/Planning Commission meeting met four times on a Saturday morning here in this building and basically both meetings were open to the public. In late June there was a new draft revision that was created and disseminated. Summer of 2010 work sessions were held both at the Board of Supervisors and also the Planning Commission. The Board of Supervisors commissioned an independent fiscal and economic analysis to evaluate the impacts of the plan. In late summer of 2010 revisions to the plan were made

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

based on some of those work session feedbacks from the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. We also received a lot of information from Marine Corps Quantico Base... Marine Corps Base Quantico as it's formally called... and tonight's version is basically titled, and the one that you should be looking at, is titled Stafford County Comprehensive Plan Draft, October 20, 2010, As Revised By The Planning Commission At Its Meeting on October 20th, 2010. There's been a lot of discussion about the UDAs. Here's some of the principles, it provides sufficient capacity to meet...

Ms. Kirkman: Excuse me, Mr. Chair?

Mr. Howard: I'm giving a Chairman's Report.

Ms. Kirkman: Is this a report or is this commentary on the public hearing tonight?

Mr. Howard: It's a report, Ms. Kirkman; you'll see in a minute.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. It provides sufficient capacity to meet ten years' growth, balance legal requirements to fiscal realities, minimize the impact of the UDAs on the transportation network, distributed density across major transportation nodes, and ensure UDAs meet community standards for education, parks and other public facilities. Also minimize the impact on the Marine Corps Base Quantico's mission. The UDAs are basically a legislative mandate that, based on our population, we believe will require us to facilitate 14,661 dwelling units and about ten million square feet of commercial, business and office. An example is the City of Fredericksburg actually has 7,000 dwelling units and that's basically taking two Cities of Fredericksburg and placing them into Stafford County. It translates to eight UDAs; there's three on the rail, two are redevelopment areas and three are on the interchange in the central part of Stafford County. The Marine Base considerations are limit residential development in a five mile radius, limit residential development to one dwelling unit per ten acres in the overfly zone which is that red kind of lined area that you see there. The impacts on the UDAs, fifty-one percent of Stafford is incompatible for UDAs which really is about only thirty-seven percent of the land area outside the military installation. The next slide, clearly you can see when you overlay the Marine Corps Base strategy, this is the visual where it really gives you the understanding of how some of the UDAs were created. I'd also point out that in the UDA legislation currently, an interpretation is the light industrial is not permitted in the land use calculation. If that were permitted in the land use calculation, you actually could probably combine the five UDAs on Route 95. We did an economic analysis that really focused on single-family detached... really focused on the costs and single-family detached homes cost the least. All residential dwelling units cost Stafford County money. Commercial money essentially is needed to offset the cost of residential and the UDAs tend to balance both.

Ms. Kirkman: Excuse me, Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair, again, I guess I was...

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, I have the floor as the Chairman and this is the Chairman's Report.

Ms. Kirkman: Are you reporting on a meeting that was held?

Mr. Howard: I'm going to get to that at the end, yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: So this is the results of a meeting that was held.

Mr. Howard: These are part of the results of meetings that were held. I didn't recognize you and I have the floor, Ms. Kirkman. Thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. I'm just a little confused because this seems like more commentary on the public hearing that we're going to be holding in half an hour. So I'm just trying to figure out why it's being (inaudible) right now.

Mr. Howard: Computer please. Thank you. In the Transportation Plan, this distributes density across the major transportation nodes to minimize the impact, identifies the new upgraded road segments to serve UDAs to be funded by proffers, and incorporates the mixed units together with commercial and public facilities to minimize the vehicle trips. We also have, in our package today and which was included I believe in the public information, the VDOT review dated October 29th. And basically, in summary, there was a meeting held in Richmond on Monday. And two of our Board of Supervisors did attend and they spoke with a subcommittee that was studying development and land use tools in the Virginia localities and pointed out many of these issues to them. And what I was pleased I guess to hear, because I was in attendance, was that the committee that worked very hard on the UDA legislation felt that Stafford County really got the grasp of what their legislation was intended to accomplish. And they were pleased with all the hard work and effort that had gone into it and really gave us, you know, a good feeling that directionally we're heading in the right direction. So, that's my update; it's an update from the meeting on Monday. Plus, again, Ms. Kirkman, I appreciate your comments but this again was anticipated to take place at the end, not before the meeting. So part of this is my update as the Chairman but also an update from the meeting that was held Monday in Richmond.

Ms. Kirkman: So, Mr. Chair, I have a question about the last slide; the one before the summary. So, the meeting that you went to, did they review our particular Comprehensive Plan and, as a committee, voted to agree that this plan will manage growth and development in a sustainable way?

Mr. Howard: There were two counties that presented; one was Prince William, one was Stafford County. And, in particular, they focused on the UDA portion of our Comprehensive Plan. They were offered copies; we obviously couldn't review the whole plan. Two of the Board of Supervisors presented some of what you just saw and there was a lot of dialogue and two-way conversation. And that subcommittee, as a whole, felt that Stafford County truly got the spirit of the intent of their UDA legislation and took some of the comments... we made recommendations that we felt should be changed in the UDA language which one would allow us to combine those five UDAs into one. And there was other suggestions made as well that the committee seemed to take and accept, however, there was a bunch of other people there encouraging the subcommittee not to make any changes at all to the legislation as it exists now; let the counties run with this and kind of see what happens. My understanding was the spirit of the group felt like Stafford had a pretty good vision, a good plan, and took all the rights steps to do the right things.

Ms. Kirkman: So, did the committee take a vote or pass a resolution to that affect?

Mr. Howard: They did not take a vote.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: But we could ask them to vote on it I guess at a future date. So, that was my Chairman's Report.

Mr. Fields: Can I ask a question Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: I noticed... I saw those slides yesterday I guess. When you're talking about the inclusion of the light industrials in the UDAs... I mean, I think it's probably, my understanding is that it's probably a debatable point about they certainly can't be used currently to calculate residential densities or commercial floor area ratios. It's clear that industrial uses are excluded from the definition of commercial here in the latest iteration of the UDA legislation. However, it doesn't mean necessarily that the area itself couldn't be encompassed in a UDA. Since this has never... these ideas... the combining of UDAs and the light industrial in the UDAs has never been discussed by the Planning Commission, to my knowledge, was the thinking that you wanted to incorporate light industrial into the calculation of the commercial aspect element of the UDAs? Or do you just feel that you want what is already seems to be permitted under the code that the land area could be included in the UDA, it just can't be calculated for commercial? What was the thrust of (inaudible)?

Mr. Howard: The land area can be included in the current legislation but it cannot be calculated for the commercial build-out. And that was the thought process.

Mr. Fields: And you want it calculated for the commercial build-out?

Mr. Howard: Well, there was debate on that. The suggestion was to allow the counties to calculate some of that, recognizing you know light industrial is very low intense use and wouldn't really necessarily accomplish some of the other things that commercial and some of the business would accomplish, with any UDA.

Mr. Fields: Now where did the idea of the combining five UDAs into one large UDA in the center part of the County come from? That's the first I'd ever heard of that.

Mr. Howard: Well, I know you weren't able to attend the meetings but we did have those Saturday meetings. And that was talked about quite a bit, if we could combine those and what that would look like.

Mr. Fields: Okay; just because, as a Commission, we've never discussed that. So I just wondered where that was.

Mr. Howard: Yeah; it's been out there.

Ms. Kirkman: Well, Mr. Chair, I'm just wondering; was there any vote on the part of the Board or on the part of the Planning Commission to combine five UDAs into one by adding that industrial area?

Mr. Howard: No. I'm not sure, Ms. Kirkman, was there? You're part of the Commission so...

Ms. Kirkman: I'm not aware of any on the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: That was the Planning Director's Report that I gave, right, so...

Ms. Kirkman: Oh, I thought it was your report.

Mr. Howard: Chairman's Report, sorry. Yeah, it was the Chairman's Report that I gave. And in the report, that's some of the detail that was covered in Richmond and I wanted to share that with the group. And to also let you know that the people who actually wrote the UDA legislation felt very strongly that Stafford County was handling this the best that they had seen to date, now recognizing they haven't seen a lot. But really felt like in the spirit of what they were trying to accomplish, this was clearly going in the right direction.

Ms. Kirkman: And you're basing that on what vote of that committee?

Mr. Howard: I'm basing that on the verbal comments that were expressed at the committee and actually it was printed in the Free Lance-Star, if I'm not mistaken. Any other questions? Okay. Committee reports.

Mr. Fields: My turn?

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Mr. Fields: Oh, okay. We met this afternoon about two different issues; the conditional proffer issue and the privatization of liquor sales issue. Of course, the conditional zoning issue is whether... the question before us is really whether the Board has asked us to look and make a recommendation; do we want to revise our guidelines and in our codes so that we are in conformance now with a new section of the Virginia Code that's similar to what's been used in Northern Virginia for many years which allows a more extensive collection of proffers in the case of a rezoning. Specifically, the most common example is relating to things like offsite improvements, etcetera, etcetera. We had a good discussion I think about a lot of those aspects of the issues. Right now we're awaiting... everybody I think, the three people agreed it was worth exploring some more. I think there's varying levels of concerns about different aspects of it and I think we agreed that we wanted to get some case studies, so to speak, from Fairfax and Loudoun and other large Northern Virginia localities that have actually used this level of authority, what they've achieved, whether they feel it's been beneficial, what time of proffers they've gotten, etcetera, etcetera, and how it's been used. So, that's where we are now and with that, we have a deadline that I think we realized because of the meeting schedule etcetera, etcetera, we're not going to be able to meet to make a decent recommendation. So, with that, I'd like to move... I think we decided we would move to request the Board of Supervisors to give us another sixty days at least past the January 3rd deadline. So I make that motion.

Ms. Kirkman: Second.

Mr. Howard: Any further discussion?

Mr. Fields: No other discussion other than just we need more time to look at it so we can do a good job basically.

Mr. Howard: Right. Okay, any discussion from anyone else? Hearing none, I'll call for the vote which would request additional time on the two issues where the ABC alcohol sales and the proffer...

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Fields: I thought we'd probably make a separation motion because they might have their own trajectory.

Mr. Howard: Alright, so this one is just on the proffer.

Mr. Fields: Yes.

Mr. Howard: Okay. All those in favor of Mr. Fields' motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed nay? The motion carries 7-0.

Mr. Fields: On the privatization of liquor sales we also had a very good discussion. This is, of course, an issue that is still pending. It has been proposed, it is an idea; it has not been adopted by the General Assembly yet. It is anticipated, right, if I'm getting this right, Jeff or Alan, that this will be on the docket at the start of the 2011 session of the General Assembly to look at doing away, for those of you at home watching, the issue is that there is a proposal to do away with the ABC system of liquor sales and go to allowing private business to sell liquor, of course regulated as those things are. And what that brings about is the issue of then does the locality have the authority, do we need extra authority, and how should we approach where we do or do not allow liquor stores to occur in the County. And that's the sum of it. And I think we, just like the other thing, I'm going to make a motion for more time partly because we really need to get into what the General Assembly is going to do or not do and have some feel for whether this will indeed become the law of the land or not. And also to once again get some more clarification; we're awaiting some information, particularly from places like Charles County, Maryland, that have had private liquor stores for a long time, to see how they regulate it and that sort of thing. With that, I'll make a motion to also ask the Board for sixty days extra time.

Ms. Kirkman: Second.

Mr. Howard: Any discussion?

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Chairman, there's no time limit actually on our agenda. What is the time limit that was provided to us and what was the actual direction or directive from the Board of Supervisors of what we're supposed to provide them back?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Harvey, do you have that handout? If not, I can find it in this stack.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Harvey: General speaking, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Hirons, the Board referred the issue to the Planning Commission. The Board did not provide an ordinance. The Board suggested the Commission look at the possibility of requiring a Conditional Use Permit for liquor sales. With that they would generally not have a specific timeline since there is no specific ordinance referred to you. So, it's more or less a study issue, but I think what we had anticipated was that there would also be a January deadline just to try to keep things on track and moving. So, our staff suggestion would be for you to solidify with the Board that they're willing to give you additional time to study it.

Mr. Howard: Right, and I found the actual wording. They wanted us to consider an option to require conditional use permits for liquor sales through the review of the conditional use permit. And to Mr. Fields' point, the legislation really hasn't been adopted yet. So we want a little more time to study that and understand from other municipalities how do they handle that, because there are some differences. We had some examples that we looked at in Maryland, we had some examples that we're reviewing in Virginia, but we really haven't had enough time. It was the first time we met and we looked at the calendar and we said you know what, we're going to need a little more time so why not just ask for the extended time up front.

Mr. Hirons: And I apologize. Did the motion have an actual sixty day...?

Mr. Fields: I said sixty days.

Mr. Hirons: I think we should actually...

Mr. Fields: It actually reminds me; I have a secondary motion I need to make, another motion after this.

Mr. Hirons: I think we should extend that time period request until the end of the General Assembly session which, this year, is the... I was going to say I think we should wait or we should extend that request for time period until the end of the General Assembly session because we have no idea what the legislation may (inaudible).

Mr. Howard: Yeah, that came up in our discussion also. When is the General Assembly session? Is it March?

Mr. Fields: Mid-March usually?

Mr. Hirons: This year I believe it's the end of March.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Fields: That's fine with me.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: I'm actually going to suggest that we not wait. And the reason for that is that we really, in terms of protecting neighborhoods from having liquor stores right next to residential homes, we don't want to wait and be behind the eight ball on this. So, I really think that, you know, if we pass something that is legally defensible and nothing happens at the General Assembly level, then we're all

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

set. But if they do pass something, we are out and being proactive. So I would suggest we not wait until that timeframe.

Mr. Howard: Well, I appreciate that comment. And the legal defensibility came up in our discussion and Mr. Smith was at the meeting. And he also is going to do some research to understand very specifically how we could word something that would be legally defensible but, to your point Ms. Kirkman, allow the County to determine through the CUP process whether or not... because we're saying it's a land use decision which does fall under our purview. And that's exactly what Mr. Smith has to research, so I'm not sure we'll know that answer in the immediate future anyway.

Ms. Kirkman: I concur that we need to get legal guidance on this. However where I disagree is that I don't think we should wait and see what the General Assembly does on the issue.

Mr. Hirons: It is all predicated on what the General Assembly does and we have time. I don't think we are going to get stuck behind the eight ball because anything that they do pass isn't going to go into effect until middle of next year roughly anyway. So you know at a minimum even waiting until the General Assembly adjourns and we know what the legislation actually looks like and its effects on us, we still have time to discuss something with ourselves, have a public hearing, pass it on to the Board, let them have their public hearing. It can all be on the books and done before the law goes into effect.

Ms. Kirkman: Actually Mr. Chair we have had instances where because of either extensions of the General Assembly or special sessions, we've actually not had adequate time to go through the process of preparing legislation, hearing at the planning commission level and getting it to the Board in time. So again I would reiterate we are talking about we are trying to protect neighborhoods from liquor stores right next to them and schools from liquor stores right next to them and we need to be proactive in that and not wait to see what the General Assembly does.

Mr. Howard: Any other discussion?

Ms. Kirkman: Could you restate what the motion is at this point?

Mr. Howard: The motion by Mr. Fields is to request a sixty day extension to allow the Planning Commission to work through the privatized liquor sales to determine whether the CUP process is a viable option for the county to take.

Ms. Kirkman: Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Hearing no one I will call for...

Mr. Hirons: Is there acceptance of a friendly amendment to extend that time period until the end of March, which would be roughly ninety days?

Mr. Fields: I respect what you are saying Mr. Hirons. I tend to agree with Ms. Kirkman, I think we can get our work...forward on our work and be in a position to be in a forward pro-active position rather than a re-active position. I certainly understand what you are saying. I think it would be an ongoing process. I think it would be better for us to have the framework of an Ordinance in place and if it needs to be modified in response to legislative reality that is easier than waiting to start until the legislative reality becomes clear. Her point is well taken that because of many deferments and things.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

This is...this could very likely be...this is a fairly large issue, could take a long time to resolve itself politically it could be somewhat nebulous in its resolution and so I think sixty days should get us in a position where we could make a solid recommendation on a CUP Ordinance.

Mr. Hirons: You are right it is a large issue and complicated issue and I don't want to get myself stuck in something and then....if we are going to extend sixty days we might as well do it within their time frame by January, so I am going to vote no on the motion.

Mr. Fields: Okay.

Mr. Howard: Okay, any other discussion? Hearing none I will call for the vote. All those in favor of signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed?

Mr. Hirons: Nay.

Mr. Howard: Motion carries 6 to 1.

Mr. Fields: In that spirit Mr. Chairman I am just trying to make these motions separate so there is not confusion. We did agree that we would like to request in the spirit of that while our analysis seems to indicate that given Mr. Marsh did a good job of giving us background on the case law regarding these things. And it seems that it is relatively clear that we have this authority. We also suggested that we make a motion requesting the Board of Supervisors to include in its legislative agenda to the Members of the House of Delegates and the State Senate that as this...as any legislation regarding the privatization of liquor sales moves forward that the local authority to govern its location through land use laws very explicitly stated. As we know in a Dillon Rule State not having things clearly laid out can quite often lead to areas of confusion. So we wanted to make sure that we asked them to include that in their legislative agenda. So I make that motion.

Ms. Kirkman: Second.

Mr. Howard: Okay, discussion? The real, since Mr. Fields didn't want to, the real...one of the reasons for this is I think Mr. Fields said it well but I just wanted to reiterate that. There is an appetite that we know of to not allow local municipalities and/or counties to have that process in place and we are looking for our Board of Supervisors to make sure that is on the legislative agenda for Stafford County because we believe that we should have a say in terms of where those business are located. So that is

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

the rationale behind that. Any other discussion? Hearing none I will call for the vote. All those in favor say aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed, nay. Motion carries 7-0. Stacie was that clear on what it is we're asking? Because that is going to have to go to the Board of Supervisors for their next meeting in order to achieve that. Okay. Alright thank you Mr. Fields.

Mr. Fields: You are welcome.

Mr. Howard: Any other Committee reports?

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Chairman have we gotten any further guidance on the TDR Joint Committee? I believe that was the one that was going to be a joint committee between us and the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Howard: I think they were waiting to see how the Comp Plan reared.

Mr. Hirons: And this one does have...I have on our list or on our agenda a time limit of January 3rd. Do we need to request more time on that just to get thing in line or is that just understood.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair I thought we had passed a motion...

Mr. Howard: We did.

Ms. Kirkman: ...either two meeting ago...

Mr. Howard: Yes, we did. We have already requested that. Very good. Okay, seeing that there is no other business on the agenda at the moment and we intentionally make this evening's agenda light. I will just take a few minutes and go over some of the ground rules. At 7:30 what will happen is we will open up the meeting to what is called public presentations. Now public presentations are not what's in front of us for a public hearing. So you can come up to us and address us on any issue when I call for public presentations. That is not part of what's on the public hearing. And tonight what's on the public hearing is the Amendments to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan. So if you want to address the Planning Commission you can do so on anything that doesn't pertain to what's on the public hearing which in this case is the Amendments to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan. When you come up to the podium, and I will repeat this later on, there will be a sign up sheet. We are

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

not going to ask you to pre-sign up. I will just announce whoever would like to address the Planning Commission after the public hearing portion may do so by getting in a single file line behind the podium. When you come up to the podium if you could just print your name and then state your name and address, you get three minutes. The three minutes will not start until you say your address. So we just ask you to print your name and that is just for the record so we have everyone's correct spelling and their name right in the minutes. After you write your name, state your name and address and then you have three minutes to address the Planning Commission. The yellow light will go on, you still have a minute left. When the red light starts to flash that indicates that your time is up and we ask you to let the next speaker address the Planning Commission. We will not address you as individuals if there are issues or concerns that come up and we can get you answers and address them as a Commission we certainly will do that this evening. I also ask you not to mention or go after a particular individual. Address all please as the Planning Commission. And if we can keep the comments as professions as possible that always makes for a good evening and everyone's voice truly gets heard when that happens. So we do have some additional time and we don't have anything else on the agenda so in a minute what I will do, and we will do this the legitimate way, we will take a vote to see if there is an appetite to take a recess. If there is no appetite to take a recess we can actually do something that is different, we've never done before, but we can do what is called stand at ease. Which means everyone stays quiet until 7:30 comes, and that is what we do. I do want to take a moment though, I do see some people in uniform and I see some Boy Scouts of America and maybe some Cub Scouts. If you could stand up for a minute, I would like to recognize you, recognize you for what you are doing in your life. Hopefully you are always prepares, right? That is the Scout motto. And I appreciate you taking the time to come down here and congratulate you for participating in BSA. So thank you very much for being here. So if anyone would want to, the real way to do it is entertain a motion for recess. Once that is made and seconded we would recess until 7:30.

Mr. Fields: I move that we recess until 7:30.

Ms. Kirkman: Second.

Mr. Howard: Is there any discussion on that? Oh I want to just say one thing, if we could get back to our seats at like 7:28 that would help us get started on time and I think staff would appreciate that, so we will take a...

Mr. Fields: Recess does not mean wander off.

Mr. Howard: ...a quick recess until 7:28. We have got to vote I guess.

Mr. Fields: Yes.

Mr. Howard: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hiron: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed. Motion carries 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

2. SUB100017; Patriot Ridge - Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 16 single family residential lots on private well and septic systems, zoned A-2, Rural Residential, consisting of 23.12 acres located on the west side of William and Mary Lane, approximately 1,200 feet south of Decatur Road on Assessor's Parcels 31-67 and 31-68 within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: December 29, 2010) (History - Deferred at October 6, 2010 Meeting to October 20, 2010 Meeting) (Deferred at October 20, 2010 Meeting to November 3, 2010 Meeting) (Deferred at November 3, 2010 Meeting to December 1, 2010 Meeting)**
3. SUB100107; Mount Hope Estates - Preliminary Subdivision Plan - A preliminary subdivision plan for 16 single family residential lots on private well and septic systems, zoned A-1, Agricultural consisting of 57.93 acres located at the end of Mount Hope Church Road, approximately 3,700 feet west of its intersection with Brooke Road on Assessor's Parcels 39-25 and 39-46 within the Aquia Election District. **(Time Limit: January 26, 2011) (History - Deferred at November 3, 2010 Meeting to December 1, 2010 Meeting)**
4. COM1000010; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review - Miracle Valley Lane Sanitary Sewer Extension - A request for review to determine compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Section 15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended, for the extension of gravity sanitary sewer outside of the Urban Services Area a length of 505 linear feet to serve two residences, located on the north side of Deacon Road and east side of Grafton Village Elementary School on Assessor's Parcels 54-132, 54-133A and 54-133B within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: July 4, 2010) (History - Deferred at May 19, 2010 Meeting to June 2, 2010 Meeting) (Deferred at June 2, 2010 Meeting to October 6, 2010 Meeting) (Deferred at October 6, 2010 Meeting to December 1, 2010 Meeting)**
5. Rappahannock River Overlay District and Potomac River Overlay District (Referred back by Board of Supervisors) **(Time Limit: October 6, 2010) (History - Deferred at June 16, 2010 Meeting to August 18, 2010) (Deferred at July 21, 2010 Meeting to September 1, 2010) (Deferred at September 1, 2010 Meeting to October 6, 2010 Meeting) (Deferred - Requesting additional time from Board of Supervisors)**
6. Discussion of Conditional Zoning (Proffers) **(Time Limit: January 3, 2011) (In Committee)**
7. Discussion of Privatized Liquor Sales **(In Committee)**

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

8. Discussion of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) (**Time Limit: January 3, 2011**) (**In Joint Committee**)

NEW BUSINESS

None

7:30 P.M.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Howard: Welcome back to the Stafford County Planning Commission meeting, November 17, 2010. We are back from our recess which started at 7:15. It is around 7:28 and we are coming back to restart our meeting. We are going to right into public presentations. I know it was probably confusion when I brought this up the last time. Public presentations are anyone from the public that wants to address the Planning Commission on any topic other than what is on our agenda for a public hearing. Which in this case is the Comp Plan, may do so when I say now. If you want to talk about the Comp Plan you will be able to do that. What is going to happen after the public presentations, staff will give us a presentation...they will give us an over view and review the Comp Plan and I estimate unless there are a lot of questions from the Commissioners, which there very well could be. It could be a forty five minute presentation that you are going to sit through and at the conclusion of the presentation the Planning Commission will then ask questions of staff for clarification and then maybe some other issues. At that point we open up what is called the public hearing and that is when you can come and address us on the Comp Plan. Okay? So I will say it again because I know there are some stares that are confusing. I am about to open up the public presentations. That is not the time that you come and address us on the Comp Plan. But you can address the Planning Commission on any other topic you would like to and you have three minutes to do so, just as you will during what is called the public hearing on the Comp Plan. And again when you come forward we just ask that you print your name. There will be a sheet on the podium, write your name then state your name and address and the green light will then go on. You can start talking you have three minutes. When the yellow light comes on you still have a minute to speak and then when the red light begins to flash we ask that you conclude your comments and allow the next speaker to address us. We will not address you directly back, we will be taking lots of notes and we will try to get answers to questions that we can. There may be a point in time also during the Planning Commissioners having discussion with staff that we may have to take a break and go into an executive session. It could happen, may not happen, not sure just so you are prepared for that. And my fellow Commissioners I would ask we have gotten some information from people watching at home that have asked that we speak more directly into the microphone so they can hear us and I would assume the same would be true for those who come to the podium. So with that I am going to open up what is called the public presentations. So anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission on any other topic than the Comprehensive Plan may do so now by stepping forward to the podium. I just ask you to state your name and address and you have three minutes to address the Planning Commission on any topic that you would like to address.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair it appears we have a full house for the Comp Plan public hearing.

Mr. Howard: Yes, it does Ms. Kirkman.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. Jobs is my topic for today. And I would like to address this and I am glad there's a bunch of citizens in here. I have been coming here for about eighteen months and I have observed some interesting things. And being a member of the Tea Party that is taxed enough already, I just want to give you some observations that I have come to conclusions about. You know we have seven Supervisors in our county and they are elected officials. And then they pick seven

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Planning Commissioners and they pay seven Utility Commissioners. There is a stipend that is paid to the Planning Commissioners that is ten thousand dollars per year. Which equates to seventy thousand dollars of our tax dollars over a four year period. That is two hundred and eighty thousand dollars. Now one of the things I think we need to think about is, why don't we take that money and create a civil servant position that would create continuity in our county. And I am not against Planning Commissioners, but I think you do a great public service but I think you can do that same public service without taking that stipend. I know some of you put it to a charity of your choice, which is very admirable. But I am interested in change going into the right pocket of the County and two hundred and eighty thousand dollars is something I think could be better used. We've waited twenty two years for a Comprehensive Plan which I am not going to talk about, but it is one of the things that you do have to deal with that goes on. Last week...it was two weeks ago I came here and one of the enlightening things to me was how some of our applicants come in and they are not even on the board of the overall planning of our community. And I know Mr. Harvey and his staff does a great job because I have use a lot of county facilities in here and if you listen to staff on any of the aspects they are very professional, they are very honorable civil servants and I think we need to substantiate that by using our tax dollars in a more effective and better way. I thank you for this opportunity and I wish each of you a very Happy Thanksgiving.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Waldowski. Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission on any topic other than what is on the public hearing which is the Comprehensive Plan may do so by stepping forward now.

Ms. Smith: Hi my name is Cherie Smith.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Smith: I am here addressing the Brown property Austin Ridge. I have several questions that I don't understand. Number one is within this large complex that they are posing to put into Austin Ridge community, it is very massive two shopping plazas of its own. I want to know number one who is going to be determining what businesses are going to go in here i.e. I heard about as I was coming in you all were talking about liquor licenses etcetera, that is a concern of mine with this major semi-mall going in behind my house. Number two I also have a concern about the massive amount of destruction of tree lines that is going to be actually be cut down and then turned into what it looks like just green land. I mean it is a great deal, huge. And so I would like for you all to address those two concerns. Number one the retail business that is going to go into this massive community behind my house. Number two the amount of tree line that is going to be destroyed and made into greenery. Number three the safety concern that I have because they are putting in sidewalks. They are putting in roads, trails and all that sits directly behind my backyard. So I would like for you all to address those three questions for me. Thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Howard: Yes Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: Could we ask the last speaker to restate her name and address. I don't know if the mike was turned off, I could not quite hear it.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Ms. Smith: Cherie Smith.

Ms. Kirkman: Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission may do so by stepping forward now. And again on any other topic that is not part of the public hearing.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Johnson: Hi my name is Maureen Johnson. And I wanted to talk about the proposed zoning change. We went to our HOA meeting last week and it was discussed that the Brown Family wants to get that zoning changed. And I can't speak for everybody but as a direct person who lives on Booth Court and will be affected by that, I just want to say that when we bought that house, and I can probably speak for all of us, it was residentially zoned. And we do not want that to be turned into a mini shopping mall no matter how high end the owner would like it to be once he sells it, once it is developed. Because we all know that doesn't always necessarily happen. And as residents of Stafford County and we do have a voice which is why you gave us this forum I know that we would like to express that we do not want that zoning to be changed. We want to keep it as it is. So that's all.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Anyone else? You can step forward again if it's not related to the Comp Plan. Okay I will just check with my left side. Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission on any other topic than the Comprehensive Plan? Seeing none, the right side of the room. My right side. Seeing none I will close the public comments. Thank you very much for participating in that. A quick comment on the... on some of the comments that were made. There is a long way to go before that property that adjoins Austin Ridge...sits between Austin Ridge and I-95 that anything takes place with that property. And you will have additional opportunities to come forward and talk about the rezoning of that property. I actually think it is zoned agricultural right now and has been zoned agricultural. There is a small parcel that is zoned commercial and that is actually on Austin Ridge Drive if you didn't know that. That has been that way since that development started. I know there was a meeting and I think there was some...there were two conversations going on at one time. One was the Comp Plan and one was Austin Ridge's issue. They are separate and independent and I think there was a link or some came away with a link. In any case you will have plenty of time to participate. There will be additional meetings you have a great HOA there. They are very actively involved and I am sure they will keep you informed and as we work with them, I know your Planning Commissioner was actually there at the meeting and she was very, you know I don't want to speak for her, if you want to comment.

Mrs. Hazard: I guess I would just say it was delightful to go to a HOA meeting where so many people were and so many people wanted to get involved. I think one thing to remember for this Austin Ridge proposal coming forward, we are I would not even say at the first steps. There is nothing even being presented. And as was discussed at the meeting that night it appears that there is a...the interchange that may be coming in at Courthouse may modify lots of plans that have been shown to people. So just trying to say we were early in the process. I give your HOA a lot of credit to invite this applicant to come in early so you all are aware of it. And you all are aware of it very early so you can keep monitoring it and like I said I am not sure what you even saw that night is going to be what may even come to be presented. Like I said I believe Mr. Dudenhefer who was there had a lot more information about that impending new interchange coming. And to be candid I have not had a chance to lay that over the proposed plan we had that night and I believe the applicant is doing that as well, because that will change traffic and other things. And going forward there is a lot more information that will come in. But like I said it was great to see so many people there and also for you to come forward and to make sure that we are aware of that. So I thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: Have we altered our process? I just want to get a clarification if we are now allowing Planning Commissioners to directly respond to speaker comments.

Mr. Howard: As I stated in the beginning Ms. Kirkman, if we could provide an answer that we would and we have always done that in the past so...

Ms. Kirkman: I am sorry, I didn't hear any questions asked by the speakers.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Well, there were numerous questions asked by the speakers. In any case, we're now on item 9 on the agenda which is the public hearings. One of the things I'm going to ask, is the commentary. Staff's going to present first and then the commentary, I really would like the room to... I know everyone has an opinion, and that's why you're here. And some of you have opinions that are different from the people you are sitting next to; that's okay. That's what makes our country great, that's what makes Stafford County great. So we are. And to hear opposing sides and different opinions and perspectives, I've always said once your mind is expanded by a new dimension, it never regains the same shape. And in some cases that's good because it allows you to think differently. Hopefully that's the outcome of tonight and we're respectful and there's no heckling and there's no reason to stop the public hearing or the proceedings. That would be, again, a terrific outcome and I think it would demonstrate how great the citizens of Stafford County are. So, I just caution that up front. So I'm going to ask staff... we're on item 9; staff will present to the Planning Commission. I think Mrs. Baker is up first. Mrs. Baker if you'd come to the podium and begin the presentation on the amendments to the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

9. AMENDMENTS TO THE STAFFORD COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (the "Comprehensive Plan") - A proposal to recommend the adoption of the proposed Stafford County Comprehensive Plan, 2010 - 2030, including the Land Use Map, dated October 20, 2010, both as revised by the Planning Commission at its meeting on October 20, 2010, as an amendment to the existing Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Sections 15.2-2229 and - 2230 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The proposed amendments include a new textual document entitled "Stafford County, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2010-2030," dated October 20, 2010, as revised by the Planning Commission at its meeting on October 20, 2010 ("2010 - 2030 Plan"). The proposed amendments also include a new Land Use Map, dated October 20, 2010, as revised by the Planning Commission at its meeting on October 20, 2010. The proposed amendments would repeal the existing Land Use Plan component of the Comprehensive Plan (January 2003, as amended), including the text of that component and the existing Land Use Map component, as well as the Transportation Plan. The proposed amendments, if adopted, would not amend any element of the Comprehensive Plan other than the existing Land Use Plan, the existing Land Use Map, and the existing Transportation Plan. A listing of all other components of the Comprehensive Plan that are not proposed to be amended may be found on page 1-5 of the proposed 2010 - 2030 Plan. **(Time Limit: November 21, 2010)**

Mrs. Baker: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. There will be three staff members that will be taking part in the presentation, so I'm going to begin. We will try and keep it moving as quickly as we can because we know there's a lot of discussion to come. May I have the computer please? As you all know, the draft Comprehensive Plan includes a new document, as well as a new Land Use Plan Map, which will guide development of the County over the next twenty years. This plan is the primary document; it will also reference separate, more detailed plan elements that are included as part of the plan. Throughout this process, the existing Land Use Plan and the existing Land Use Map would be repealed. The existing plan has served as the main Comp Plan element since 1988 and has been updated many times, most recently in 2003. The existing Land Use Map has been updated more frequently, as late as this summer. The proposal would also repeal the existing Transportation Plan element as a Transportation Plan chapter has been added to this draft document. The Comprehensive Plan is a policy document that guides the physical development of the County and provides a benchmark for evaluating new development proposals. It also identifies future service needs of the residents. The plan would reflect the community's vision for what the County should look

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

like over the next twenty years. The document would also serve to evaluate local characteristics and trends, and it would be evaluated at least every five years and adjusted to meet the changing needs of the County. It could be adjusted more frequently than that but we're mandated by the State law to do it every five years. The plan does not create new regulations; it's going to create new policies which would require implementation of new ordinances and regulations to support the goals of the plan. And we'll get into a little bit more detail on that later. The process for this new plan began in April of 2006 and that's when the County hired a consultant and formed a Steering Committee to assist staff in the preparation of the plan. Since May of 2007, the plan has been under review by the Planning Commission, as well as the Board of Supervisors. There have been opportunity for public input throughout the process including early public input sessions and surveys that were sent to the citizens. For several months there were weekly Steering Committees. In addition, there have been numerous Comp Plan Committee meetings, Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission work sessions. All of these meetings have been open to the public. In 2008 a revised plan was developed by a new Planning Commission. In 2009 the Board revised the plan, conducted a joint public hearing with the Planning Commission but there was no action taken at that time. So, here we are now in October; the Planning Commission has authorized this latest version of the Comprehensive Plan. This plan recommends more generalized future land uses which reflect form, density and intensity of development. It encourages infill development and redevelopment in established suburban areas. It also recommends less growth in the agricultural or rural areas through means such as creation of a Transfer of Development Rights, or TDR, program and the continuation of the County's Purchase of Development Rights Program, or PDR Program. Growth projections for the County are derived for mandated state population projections. This includes figures from the Virginia Employment Commission. These growth projections help identify the cost of growth and the facility needs to support an increased population. The plan recognizes potential conflicts with military activities. It also identifies transportation improvements and recommends new road networks. Chapter 2 of the plan includes goals and objectives and this provides the framework for physical development. It also includes policies for each of these goals and objectives to help accomplish the desired goals. So there are nine main goal topics which are discussed, including sustainability, fiscal responsibility, the environment, ensuring health, safety and well-being of all the County residents, promoting affordable, accessible and quality housing for residents, creating adequate transportation system to move citizens and products safely through the County. Also support economic development through appropriate land use policies, continue the support of quality education, and promote and protect and preserve the County's cultural resources. I'm going to point out some of the key policies. There are too many to go through each one so I will point out some of the key policies of the plan, including some of the growth management tools that support the goals. First of all, the establishment of a clear Urban Services Area, or USA boundary, and Mike will talk some more about this in just a few minutes. The USA does include the provision of services such as water and sewer and higher capacity roads to support residential and commercial development. Water and sewer would primarily be limited to areas within the USA. The plan designates Urban Development Areas, or UDAs, which provide areas for more intense development and is pedestrian friendly and transient oriented. And again Mike will get into some more details of this. Another key policy is recommending eighty per cent of future residential growth to be located within the USA and this would be tracked through development plans and permit activity. The plan promotes infill development and redevelopment areas and areas that are already being developed throughout the county. The county has initiated four redevelopment plans and you will see a little bit more detail on that. I already mentioned the establishment of TDR Program another key policy is giving priority to transportation and improvements within the USA. Additional policies are...the plan recommends development of Level of Service standards and a public facilities plan to identify future facility needs such as schools, parks and fire and rescue stations. The plan recommends

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

the establishment of land use patterns that reduce vehicle trips such as creating mixed use districts for development. The plan does recommend minimizing land use conflicts with activities at Marine Corp Base Quantico. It also recommends promoting housing opportunities for all income and age ranges, prioritizing safety improvements over capacity improvements for our roads, providing and maintaining a multi-modal transit system including rail and bus service as well as alternate modes of transportation such as pedestrian, also establishing a stewardship program to care for the county owned cultural resources. So with that I am going to turn the microphone over Mike Zuraf to discuss Chapter 3 and the following chapters.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: Will we have the opportunity to ask questions of each speaker as they finish?

Mr. Howard: We can kind of sort of poll the Commission if that is the desire of the group. Yes, people seem okay with that. Do you have questions for Mrs. Baker?

Ms. Kirkman: Yes sir I do.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: Mrs. Baker, you stated under your slide regarding the process that there was opportunities for significant input, this draft that we have before us is dramatically different than any other draft that has appeared before the Planning Commission. Where there any surveys taken of citizens regarding the draft and the changes in the draft that we have before us tonight?

Mrs. Baker: No we did not.

Ms. Kirkman: Were there any community meetings?

Mrs. Baker: No community meeting other than the open forums for these committee meetings and work sessions. They were open to the...

Ms. Kirkman: You mean where people could come and observe the meetings?

Mrs. Baker: At each Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings there is an opportunity for public input at any meeting. So if anyone had questions or comments on the Comprehensive Plan that was their opportunity to do that.

Ms. Kirkman: And was any effort made to get input specifically on the proposed Urban Development Areas?

Mrs. Baker: Not as part of the public process. That is something that will continue once the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. We do have a consultant that is going to be going fully through the process at such time.

Ms. Kirkman: And that will be after the Comprehensive Plan is approved?

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mrs. Baker: A more detailed study of the individual areas will occur at that time.

Ms. Kirkman: And then you stated that this plan recommends less growth in the rural areas. Given the current zoning in the County, how many... does the proposed plan have more or less acres for A-1 and A-2 as proposed future land use?

Mrs. Baker: I am going to have to ask Mr. Zuraf the assist me with the calculations there. Do you have those handy? Are you talking just what is potential to change for...?

Ms. Kirkman: Uh-huh.

Mrs. Baker: For agricultural?

Ms. Kirkman: Yes.

Mrs. Baker: Do we have that...

Ms. Kirkman: More areas that are zoned agricultural now, are they going to continue as agricultural or are they going to be something else?

Mrs. Baker: Well, this plan is not changing any zoning; it is just changing...

Ms. Kirkman: The recommendation is what I am asking about; the future land use, the proposed land use.

Mrs. Baker: When Mike gets into the actual mapping, he is going to show the areas that have been changed on the maps. I don't have the specific number in front of me; we can certainly look them up in the plan.

Ms. Kirkman: So Mr. Zuraf will be able to present whether or not there is more or less proposed agricultural acres?

Mrs. Baker: Yes, I believe that is going to show on the maps when he gets to that.

Ms. Kirkman: And then you stated that the priority will be to put transportation improvements in the Urban Service Area. Some of our most dangerous roads are actually in the agricultural areas. Does that mean those unsafe road conditions will have to go at the back of the line until all the needs in the Urban Service Areas are met?

Mrs. Baker: Well, I think we will have to look at two different things, the safety consideration and the capacity. We are not planning to do away with recommendations that... such as our Youth Driver Task Force and make recommendation for safety improvements on the roads. So we will have to look at those as we get into the transportation implementation plan.

Ms. Kirkman: But those slides said that transportation improvements and that would include safety improvements.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mrs. Baker: Primarily focusing on capacity upgrades to handle the increase of development that would happen within the Urban Services Area and the Urban Development Areas.

Ms. Kirkman: So does the plan state that the priority is only for capacity and that the safety issues will be addressed in equal weight to the capacity issues?

Mrs. Baker: I would have to look up the specific... can you give me just a minute to look those up? I will read you the wording.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mrs. Hazard: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Howard: Mrs. Hazard.

Mrs. Hazard: I would direct us to policy 1.4.5.

Mr. Howard: Okay, go ahead.

Mrs. Hazard: When we talk about road improvement should be focused in the Urban Development Areas into a lesser extent than the Urban Services Areas to support the areas of targeted growth, which I take to say that goes to capacity. But then safety and general welfare of the public should be the primary consideration for road improvements outside of the Urban Services Area which I don't think in any way means to say that all the work that has been done on the safety and some of the things that we saw at the Transportation Committee are going to be thrown out. I do believe that there still is certainly a concern for safety in all parts of the County. But...

Mr. Howard: I recall too, I don't know where the language is, but the transportation bond referendum that passed was prioritized in large part by the Youth Driver Taskforce in terms of safety perspective and all that continues to carry forward through the plan. Mrs. Baker did you have anything else?

Mrs. Baker: Does that answer what you were looking for?

Ms. Kirkman: Well it sounds like perhaps it was just a misstatement on the slide around the prioritization.

Mr. Howard: Are there any other questions for Mrs. Baker while she is at the podium? Of course we reserve the right to call you back.

Mrs. Baker: You will be in capable hands with Mike Zuraf.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, Mike Zuraf, Principal Planner with the Planning and Zoning Department. If I can have the presentation back again please.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Zuraf, can I just interrupt? Is the audience okay with the lights out? Is that to help you see the screen? Okay, good; just want to make sure. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, I'm going to talk to you about Chapter 3 which is the Land Use Plan. The image that you see on the screen is the draft Land Use Map. This map basically encapsulates a lot of what is in the Land Use Plan all in one place. It depicts the location and intensity of the use of land in the County. And, at this scale I'm not going to go into all the details but I will be getting into that as we go through. The Land Use Plan and Land Use Map kind of breaks the County into generalized land use districts. There are Urban Development Areas, suburban areas, business and industry areas and agricultural/rural areas. Those are the main areas that kind of affect the intensity of development. Some other districts that are reflected on the Land Use Map include mining and extraction areas, parkland, federal land such as Quantico, and Resource Protection Areas that typically follow floodplains and buffers along streams. This map goes over and depicts the Urban Services Area. The Urban Services Area helps with growth management in the County. There are several different ways to manage growth and the establishment of an Urban Services Area is one of them. An Urban Services Area is basically the designation of an area that where a community would recommend higher intensity development to occur where maybe more transportation improvements might be recommended to handle higher capacity, where more community facilities such as schools and fire stations may be recommended to be located because you have greater concentration of population in these areas. So this shaded in area reflects the County's Urban Services Area. This is an element that has been part of the County's long range planning for many years. Also, just for clarification as well, we had a big advertisement and I did get some phone calls about that and there was maybe some confusion. We've listed out Assessor's Parcel numbers, peoples' property numbers in that advertisement and what that was doing was identifying properties that were either being added to or deleted from the Urban Services Area, in whole or in part. So somebody would call and say "hey, my parcel is not on there but I'm in this Urban Development Area; why is my parcel not listed?" And that's because they likely were always in the Urban Services Area and they still are so there is no change. So if your property was not listed it just means there was no change from the current map to this map. This next image identifies redevelopment areas in the County. This corresponds with special area studies that the County has undertaken in these locations. These areas include, in the northern part of the County, Boswell's Corner, where we are now in the Courthouse area, to the south of us along Route 17, west of 95, this area is known as Southern Gateway, and in the historic Falmouth area. There are efforts that have occurred over the last several years by the County to look at redevelopment of these locations. The County sees economic development opportunities in those locations and this idea is carried through into this new plan. This next image and part of the chapter of the Land Use Plan looks at potential sewer service area. This is a Rock Hill sewer service area. This reflects some areas where there are potential for future sewer line extensions that would be outside of the Urban Service Area. Typically, and what the plan recommends, is for public utilities such as sewer and water lines to be located inside the Urban Service Area. Well, this plan locates some special situations. In this area there are some older residential neighborhoods where failing drainfields have occurred and where the County has to subsequently do pump and haul to deal with that; and so it's been identified that there might be a need in the future to extend sewer lines out to these areas. The next area reflects an area that may need a water extension outside of the Urban Service Area. This is the Hartwood water service area. This blue shaded area is at the intersection of Hartwood Road and Route 17; it's basically in the area of Hartwood Elementary School and this just recognizes that there may be a future need to extend the public water line out to Hartwood Elementary School in the future. Also, the Land Use Plan recognizes the activities that occur on Quantico Marine Corps Base. This map shows certain areas that might be impacted within the County from activities on Quantico. The red shaded areas are the areas that have bubbles; these are noise zones that are identified around certain ammunition ranges on the Base. And the red area is a five mile radius that's been identified by Quantico as being areas that may be impacted by noise from the Base. And then the hatched in area recognizes aircraft over-

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

flight areas; jets that might be flying over the County and may impact residents in these areas. The plan has several policies related to what might be recommended in these areas and that also includes certain Land Use compatibility charts for these areas. Next I want to get into some of those specific land use designations that the map includes. The first is the Urban Development Areas. The Urban Development Areas are areas where the more urban scale development might occur. This is an area, a designation that actually is mandated under State Code under Section 15.2-2223.1 of the State Code. And it applies to certain high growth localities, Stafford being one of them and we have until July 1, 2011 to designate these Urban Development Areas. Within these areas the density of development that is recommended and has to occur in these areas is at least twelve dwelling units per acre for any condominium or multi-family units, six dwelling units per acre for townhouse developments, and four dwelling units per acre for single-family detached housing, and then .4 Floor Area Ratio for commercial development. The Urban Development Areas are also required to be designed to be able to accommodate ten to twenty years of projected growth and that has to be based on State recognized numbers, so we have to go by the Virginia Employment Commission projections. And what that all equates to is that we have to identify 14,661 dwelling units within our Urban Development Areas. And the actual location and number of the Urban Development Areas was worked on by a Joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Committee and what was proposed ended up being eight locations. And I'll get into each location in a little more detail. There were questions about why so many areas. Well, kind of what was discussed was that the Committee felt that there was not one area in the County that could accommodate 14,000 units so that's why the units were kind of spread out. And the types of Urban Development Areas kind of fall into three different categories; two of them correspond with redevelopment areas that I've mentioned earlier, those being around the Courthouse area and then the second one being Route 17 at Southern Gateway. The second type is basically in areas in the center part of the County along the Interstate. You have the George Washington Village Urban Development Area in this location, west of the Courthouse Road interchange, the Eskimo Hill Urban Development Area and then the Centerport Urban Development Area. And the last types were Urban Development Areas along the rail line. They include Leeland Station, the Brooke VRE Station and a recommended new station to the northern part of the County along the Potomac River. This area in the plan is called Stafford Station. Looking at the recommendations within the plan for these individual Urban Development Areas, this first Urban Development Area that I identified around the Courthouse area, this basically encompasses the core of the redevelopment area that the County is studying. And within this area, the plan recommends 656 multi-family units and 1.3 million square feet of commercial development. It also recommends upgraded road network; that's identified within Chapter 4 of the plan. The second Urban Development Area which relates to... is tied to redevelopment areas is called Southern Gateway. This is down along Route 17 west of the interchange with 95. In this location, the plan recommends 1,876 residential units; half multi-family or condos and half townhomes. And also the plan recommends 2.6 million square feet of commercial development. The third Urban Development Area is Stafford Station. This would be located along a new VRE station that would be recommended as part of the plan. In this location the plan recommends 3,250 residential units with a mix being 750 multi-family or condominium units, 300 townhomes and 2,200 single-family units. In addition, there are some business areas recommended within this UDA that would allow for potential 5.2 million square feet of commercial development. There's also several public facilities recommended in this area, including an elementary school, fire station, several hundred acres of park land, a recreational facility, also a four-lane parkway would be needed to be constructed to get to this location from US Route 1. As mentioned, a new commuter rail station would be needed and a park and ride lot is recommended as well. The fourth Urban Development Area is George Washington Village. This would include 3,250 residential units, the same mix as Stafford Station, with 750 multi-family units, 300 townhomes and 2,200 single-family units. Also, a significant

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

amount of commercial square feet is recommended in the order of 10 million square feet in this location. Also, as far as facility upgrades, it would recommend the extension of Mine Road through this area from Courthouse Road approximately in this area down through the site to Ramoth Church Road. Also, a park and ride lot is recommended, a commuter and van pool bus transit station is recommended, several hundred acres of park land as well in this area, a recreation facility with indoor amenities and an elementary school and fire station as well. This Urban Development Area five is Brooke Station. This is located on land in the vicinity around the existing Brooke VRE Station which is located in this area. In this Urban Development Area, the plan recommends 750 residential units, 400 multi-family condominiums and 350 townhomes, also 1.5 million square feet of commercial development. The plan recommends also an acre of park land be designated for every four residential units and then improvements to Brooke Road between Eskimo Hill Road and Brooke Station to get out to this area. The sixth Urban Development Area is known as Eskimo Hill. This is basically in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Route 1 and Eskimo Hill Road. It's off the screen but the landfill is to the east of this site. This Urban Development Area would recommend 879 residential units, 319 multi-family units, 160 townhomes and 400 single-family units and, in addition, 500,000 square feet of commercial development. Also, in this area, 500 parking spaces would be recommended to be added to the Brooke VRE Station to serve this community. Also, improvements to Eskimo Hill Road from Route 1 to Brooke Road are recommended and several hundred acres of park land with finished athletic fields are recommended as well. The Urban Development Area seven is known as Centerport. This area would recommend 3,250 residential units, 750 multi-family units, 300 townhomes and 2,200 single-family units, and with that would be 1.6 million square feet of commercial. It would also require, as far as public facilities, a four-lane divided road would be recommended from Centerport Parkway in this location to the west over to Warrenton Road, a 1,000 space park and ride lot, commuter van pool and transit station and several hundred acres of park land as well. Urban Development Area eight would be an Urban Development Area recommended around Leeland Station. This area would have 750 multi-family units and 1.5 million square feet of commercial. Two hundred acres of park land is recommended, an indoor recreation facility and a fire station. That basically summarizes the Urban Development Areas that were recommended as part of this plan

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Fields: Mr. Chairman, I have three questions related to the Urban Development Area.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: This seems like a logical point. I'm referencing... I have three question actually related to how this document presented to us tonight, the Comprehensive Plan relates to the enabling legislation. So, I'm reading from, and if there's a later version please correct me, I'm reading from Chapter 528, approved April 11, 2010, which is amending the enactment of what was known as House Bill 1071 amending Section 15.2-2223.1 of the Code of Virginia. It says, paragraph three under heading B, it says that "future residential and commercial growth shall be based on official estimates of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia or projections of the Virginia Employment Commission or the United States Bureau of the Census". We've sort of been told and it's been referenced that we're relying solely on the projections of the VEC. The legislation seems to enable three different approaches to it and I'm just trying to get some clarification why have we zeroed in on the VEC solely and not used the Weldon Cooper?

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Zuraf: The Weldon Cooper Center, to the best of my knowledge, does not have projections.

Mr. Fields: Right. But it says right here that we can use the estimates from the Weldon Cooper Center. It says right here in the code, doesn't it?

Mr. Zuraf: Right, but we have to deal with, you know, this plan is projecting out into twenty years out and the Weldon Cooper Center doesn't provide us any of that data.

Mr. Fields: Okay, the second...

Ms. Kirkman: Excuse me, Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: Yes ma'am?

Ms. Kirkman: Can I just ask... but the Weldon Cooper does provide some projections and I thought this plan was only... that the UDAs were only based on ten years out. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Zuraf: It is.

Ms. Kirkman: And how far out does the Weldon Cooper Center projections go?

Mr. Zuraf: I don't believe they have projections.

Ms. Kirkman: None whatsoever.

Mr. Zuraf: Not that I'm aware of. If they do then I guess I stand corrected.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Fields: It also says, number seven under B also says "the Comprehensive Plan shall describe any financial and other incentives for development in the Urban Development Areas". Is that in... I'm not really aware; can you highlight that for me or have we gotten to that point yet in this process? Are we describing or offering any concepts for financial incentives for this?

Mr. Zuraf: No... well, I think... yeah, it's not really described within this. I think that may be a follow-up effort through our Urban Development Area grant. That may, where you get into more detailed plans within each Urban Development Area, that may come of that.

Mr. Fields: Also, heading E states "localities shall consult with adjacent localities as well as the relevant Planning District Commissions and the Metropolitan Planning Organization in establishing the appropriate size and location of Urban Development Areas to promote orderly and efficient development of their region". And can you describe for me how that has been accomplished?

Mr. Zuraf: We've provided notice to all adjacent localities. A presentation was made to the George Washington Regional Commission; I forget which date that was on. But the Urban Development Areas were presented to the Regional Planning Agency. But we've provided notice to all adjacent localities, also to Quantico, and I think you actually did receive tonight the one bit of feedback. We did get comments back from Prince William County on the Comp Plan.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Fields: Okay, but there's been no official action by the George Washington Regional Commission or FAMPO on our UDAs, no official response saying, you know, on a scale of one to ten we think it's a five or a ten or a one? Other than the presentations have we had any two way dialogue about that?

Mr. Zuraf: I will defer to Mr. Harvey on that.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Fields and Mr. Chairman, we have not received any written correspondence from George Washington Regional Commission or FAMPO.

Mr. Fields: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Any other questions of Mr. Zuraf?

Ms. Kirkman: Let me first get a clarification. Do you have additional material you're going to presenting Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. So, just regarding the Urban Development Areas, is the PD-1 and the PD-2 Districts that we have now, the zoning districts, do they map to the UDAs or to the suburban land use?

Mr. Zuraf: The PD-1 and PD-2 Districts are more... those are, I guess, floating districts where they may work in some of those areas but may not. Well, actually PD-2, I don't think that would actually comply and work in the Urban Development Areas because the density on a PD-2 District is it basically has a maximum density of three dwelling units per acre. So PD-2 would not work; PD-1 is a possibility but we've not stated specifically in the plan that PD-1 will work only in this location or there. It's more of a floating zone that would have to be evaluated.

Mr. Hirons: And Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow-up.

Mr. Howard: Wait one second, Mr. Hirons. Before Ms. Kirkman interjected, Mr. Fields did yield to her. So, Ms. Kirkman, are you finished?

Ms. Kirkman: No, I have additional questions but...

Mr. Howard: Would you yield to Mr. Hirons?

Mr. Hirons: It's related to...

Ms. Kirkman: But I'll be glad to if it's related to this.

Mr. Hirons: ... this issue. How does the plan address zoning needs within the UDAs? I believe we talk about form based needs and needs that we're going to need to address during the implementation phase with the zoning code?

Mr. Zuraf: Right. As part of the Urban Development Area grant, the consultant that the County has to help with that will work on developing a model or form based code that the County may wish to adopt that may provide the County better zoning tools to make this work.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Hirons: So, it's probably not necessarily fair to utilize what we currently have within our Zoning Ordinance to these UDAs because we will have this need for form based code to develop.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, there's going to be a need for some sort of modification. The current zoning designations are kind of limited as far as their applicability to Urban Development Areas but it doesn't necessarily have to be form based code; it can be even modification of what we currently have.

Mr. Hirons: Thank you sir. Thank you Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: So, to... I just want to make sure I understand. The Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on future land uses of the County without knowing what the zoning for those land uses will look like.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, typically, your zoning will follow what the land use... it would be in response to what recommended land uses would be.

Ms. Kirkman: During your presentation, you stated the Urban Services Area is used to manage growth. How is that used to manage growth?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it serves as a guide for the County so if somebody comes in for a rezoning on any random property in the County, the idea is to evaluate that proposal against the Land Use Map. And the Land Use Map includes an Urban Service Area boundary and that, I guess, would help to direct the County as to what's recommended on that property. So, it controls maybe the zoning that may occur and may be recommended.

Ms. Kirkman: And is the Urban Services Area, under this proposed plan, larger or smaller than it currently exists?

Mr. Zuraf: It's a little bit larger.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. And you stated the Urban Development Areas are mandated under State Code. Does the State Code mandate how many Urban Development Areas there have to be?

Mr. Zuraf: No it does not.

Ms. Kirkman: You stated that the Urban Development Area in Widewater includes a new VRE station. Does VRE have a station at Widewater in its capital improvements plan?

Mr. Zuraf: No it does not.

Ms. Kirkman: Then, under UDA number seven, you referenced a four-lane road connector; is that the western outer connector that's been talked about for many years?

Mr. Zuraf: It's the northwest quadrant, yeah. It follows that similar alignment.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. And then, just out of curiosity, I remember when we started this process several years ago, Mr. Zuraf. And back when I first started on the Planning Commission you brought in a proposed map that included an extension of Mine Road and that was removed. And now it's appeared

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

again. I'm just wondering... back three years ago where you got the idea that Mine Road should be extended.

Mr. Zuraf: That's the Mine Road that's currently on our Transportation Plan.

Ms. Kirkman: The extension is?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you. And it has been since 2005?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, great; thanks for that clarification.

Mr. Howard: Are there any other questions for Mr. Zuraf? Mrs. Hazard?

Mrs. Hazard: Yes, I was just wanting to go back to when we talked about the zoning. I just wanted to reference that our policy, 1.2.5 which was in the 2008 plan and in our current plan which was retained, the only change that we made was that it did not occur in 2011. I would just like to clarify that it says that the "county shall establish a mixed use district and design standards for development in the Urban Development Areas". Then it tracks with the language and it said "the design standards shall incorporate principals of new urbanism and traditional neighborhood development", which it appears that both times that we have tried to look at this that we knew that would be a future development. The change we did make in this particular plan was to take out "in 2011". I think we thought we might want to get ahead of that curve, and it is my hope, as a member of the Commission, that this will be one of the first things that we put in our implementation plan.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Hirons, any questions?

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Zuraf, a number of the UDAs call out for various improvements and amenities within UDAs. How does the plan address that those get paid for?

Mr. Zuraf: The plan recommends that they be provided by development that occurs by developers that come in to develop in those locations.

Mr. Hirons: Thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Or through proffers.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair? I actually have a question for either of the attorneys regarding that particular issue. And, specifically, does the locality have any ability to require the improvements that are listed and do you see any impediments to being able to do so?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Smith or ...?

Ms. Kirkman: Whoever wants to go for it.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Smith: Proffers are voluntary. The County cannot require a proffer. They are voluntarily offered by the developer.

Ms. Kirkman: I had one other question about the UDAs. You stated that you got a lot of calls from people about their properties being added to the Urban Services Area? What were those...

Mr. Zuraf: Well, it was just... it wasn't necessarily a lot, it was like maybe two or three.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay.

Mr. Zuraf: So I just wanted to clarify that. And it wasn't that it was being added, it was just that they didn't see their parcel number listed in the ad and so I just wanted to clarify what that meant.

Ms. Kirkman: And do you know the total number of properties that are being added to the Urban Services Area?

Mr. Zuraf: No, not off the top of my head.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Okay, Mrs. Hazard? One more?

Mrs. Hazard: Sorry. I'm a lawyer too; I have to have my last word in. I guess I would refer to the attorneys as well. When we have an objective 1.7 that both our policy objections of 1.7.1 and 1.7.2, these two policies talk about potential for phasing of Urban Development Areas based on the availability of public services, adequate infrastructure, population growth, and it also says that these changes should be rejected until the projected changes have been implemented. It was not my understanding that there was counsel recommendation that we should delete those policies. Basically, I'm sorry, since those in the audience may not have it in front of them, but the new development proposals related to Urban Development Areas do seem that we have in the plan that it should be based on public services being available and dependent on these future changes.

Mr. Howard: So, did you understand the question?

Mr. Taves: I think so. I guess what I would say is that when a new development proposal comes in, that developer has two options; either to wait for the County itself to provide the infrastructure, if the County has the money to do that and the will to do that, or the developer can provide it himself.

Mr. Howard: I would also add that the General Assembly has authorized a County like Stafford under their Virginia Code 2303, I think it is, to have a little more leeway on proffers. We haven't necessarily adopted that yet as a County but I know that that is sort of work in progress; it's being worked on now. So, we will have the opportunity, as a County, to have a little more influence is the term I would use on developers to help participate and pay for offsite proffers or take cash for offsite improvements, whereas in the past we did not have that opportunity. But the General Assembly has changed that for the County of Stafford, so that will help us going forward.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, can I ask a follow-up question to that?

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: I thought there had been a State Attorney General's opinion that rezoning applications could not be denied due to lack of public infrastructure? Is anyone familiar with that?

Mr. Smith: Yes, Ms. Kirkman, I'm familiar with the opinion that you're referring to. And yes, there is an Attorney General's opinion that says that.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, if we can go back to the computer please. Now I want to kind of just highlight some of the other land use districts on the Land Use Map. This next district is one of the suburban areas. The Land Use Map just generally identifies two main suburban areas on the Land Use Map; that is designated by the bright yellow area. And these areas are designated in mainly established and developing suburban areas in north Stafford and in south Stafford around Fredericksburg. Basically, it encourages the continuation of a suburban form of development that has occurred in these locations of the County. The land use intensities recommended in this area are three dwelling units per acre...

Ms. Kirkman: Excuse me, Mr. Zuraf? There seems to be a sidebar conversation going on and I think perhaps maybe we should bring it back to that. Regarding our Chair and the attorneys, is there something we need to know about?

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, you're out of order and I will call you out of order again should you interrupt Mr. Zuraf. When he's done speaking you may ask him questions. Go ahead Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, the development intensities recommended in suburban areas are for maximum of three dwelling units per acre and new development is recommended to be single-family detached residential type of housing. In these areas, you'll see that there are some of the road corridors are highlighted in orange. The plan recommends and highlights commercial corridors and commercial nodes with the orange stars. And this recognizes areas where suburban scale commercial development has occurred and is recommended to continue. The plan does include several design and use criteria for the commercial development in the suburban land use. The next one is business and industry areas. Those are highlighted in grey. These are located in areas where there is strictly recommended business office and industrial uses. Some of these areas are basically included where there is existing business and industry development. For example, in south Stafford this map, you can see where this is Cool Springs Road and so this is the industrial area recommended around Cool Springs Road... just as one example. The areas of the County outside of the Urban Service Area... by the way, the Urban Service Area is highlighted in red with suburban land use being the land use within... the areas outside are called agricultural rural areas. This is where the continuation of farming is recommended and then also if there is residential development, a minimum lot size of three acres is recommended for residential uses. In these areas, the plan notes that there would be limited community services provided because there's less population in these areas. Also, just staff does want to point out an issue that was raised that there's the map itself calls the area rural but the text calls it agricultural/rural and staff would recommend that the Commission consider recommending a change to bring the map in line with the text. So, basically to amend the map to call this area agricultural/rural. These two images provide a side by side comparison of the current and proposed Land Use Maps. The current Land Use Map is on the left and I guess I can get at the issue; the one question that was raised was how much agricultural is being changed under this new plan. And I did mention that the Urban Service Area is a

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

little bit larger than what you have in the current Land Use Map. The current Urban Service Area is the black line that somewhat matches the Urban Service Area that's recommended in the proposed Land Use Map. Some of the differences in areas where the Urban Service Area is expanding is in areas south of Courthouse Road, west of Interstate 95; there is higher density residential development in this area and a sewer line that runs along this stream. Another area is associated with the two Urban Development Areas along the rail line. The Brooke Station Urban Development Area is a new Urban Development Area and then expansion of the Urban Service Area out to the Stafford Station Urban Development Area. So those are the main areas of expansion. And, at this point, I will hand it over to Joey.

Mr. Hess: Thank you Mike. Okay, continuing on the presentation. Chapter 4, the Transportation Plan. The plan addresses transportation needs, it highlights under, or within rather, figure 4.2 the approved road improvement projects which also are identified under table 4.1 with approved funding. These funding sources, or example of funding sources, are the transportation bond or VDOT's six year plan. The plan also identifies new road segments to facilitate traffic circulation. Many of these improvements are shown within the Urban Development Areas; they include road and transit improvements. The plan also contains a future transportation implementation plan which would require the rerunning of the transportation model to help identify what improvements are needed and necessary. Moving along to Chapter 5, it's titled Public Costs of Growth. The purpose of this chapter is to ensure that the public level of services are provided in a fiscally responsible manner and that adequate public facilities are available to support development and its impacts. How this is accomplished is through identifying desirable levels of service and/or to continue to provide existing levels of service. Two examples we identify are providing twenty acres of and/or passive and active park land per a thousand residents or the next example is providing one square foot of library floor area per capita. That's actually a new standard that just changed not too long ago. The old standard was .06. So those are two desirable levels of service. The other one I talked about was providing existing levels of service, so the methodology in those cases would be to look at what is currently being provided as far as, for instance, we could say fire and rescue and government; we look at the building square footage being provided today and look at that per capita basis. So, that again would be an example of existing service levels that we just continue here on out. Chapter 5 also identifies the associated cost per public facilities per residential unit. That figure right now is shown to be, per single-family dwelling unit, \$75,539. Chapter 5 also indicates that there are ways to mitigate public facility costs. Two methods are through proffers and through transportation impact fees. So, again these are methods in which impacts can be mitigated either through cash or donation. Continuing on with Chapter 5, it also contains projections for future public facility needs. This is identified in the appendix under Section B which is the Public Facilities Plan. The Public Facilities Plan goes from year 2010 to year 2030. Currently, as it shows right now... let me make sure I get this right... it shows that there's a need for eight elementary schools, four middle schools, five high schools, five fire and rescue stations, approximately 1,900 acres of parks and rec area, three libraries, and a little over 147,000 square feet of general government space as identified in the charts in the appendix. And this is based on, again, population projections for the next twenty years to 2030. And finally with Chapter 5, its intent is to develop a financial impact model to evaluate how growth might affect government finances. The Comprehensive Plan recommends to adopt this at a later date. And lastly, Chapter 6. Chapter 6 is the existing conditions. This chapter provides existing characteristics of the community such as housing, the economy, historical and cultural resources. It also have detailed maps such as the population density, community facilities. It also contains population projections both inside and outside the USA, the Urban Service Area, and it also is a source of existing facility data such as

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

schools, parks and rec, and other public facilities. It's basically inventory lists. And with that, I will turn it back to Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Howard: Are there questions of Mr. Hess while he's at the podium?

Ms. Kirkman: Yes, Mr. Chair, I have some.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: You're the lucky winner Joey; you got the good chapters.

Mr. Hess: Oh yeah?

Ms. Kirkman: So, since you handled the transportation chapter, does that mean that you can address some questions regarding the comments we just received from VDOT this weekend?

Mr. Hess: I would have to defer those to Mr. Harvey.

Ms. Kirkman: Alright, Mr. Harvey. So, Mr. Harvey, what we heard from VDOT, one of their suggestions was that the Comprehensive Plan should more clearly outline the densities within each UDA. And I think what they're looking for is that it needs to specifically state that there's a minimum of four single-family residences, six townhomes or twelve apartments or condominium units or cooperative units per acre, and the authorized floor area ratios. Have we addressed that comment from VDOT?

Mr. Harvey: We have not specifically addressed that comment.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. Then, regarding UDA number 3, the Widewater UDA, it states that there "is no viable transportation infrastructure connecting the UDA location to Route 1 and 95 without the planned improvements". So, if this is approved without that, what happens?

Mr. Harvey: That would be a problem for the County. If the County went ahead and approved development without the necessary infrastructure, we would suffer for it. And that's what VDOT's attempting to point out.

Ms. Kirkman: And then they go on to say that "at build-out, this road could potentially be operating at near capacity". Does that mean even if the road is built as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, when it's built there's not much capacity for future growth?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct. That's what their comment would imply, that at build-out of the UDA, that road would not have additional capacity for future improvements.

Ms. Kirkman: Then, regarding UDA number 5, Brooke Station, it states that most of the traffic will be going out through Route 630 which is Courthouse Road in order travel north. And what's VDOT's thinking that cars are going to be commuting from Brooke northwards since this is a VRE UDA?

Mr. Harvey: I can't speak directly for VDOT's comments, but based on the development experience we've seen in Stafford County, specifically with Leeland Station you'll find that some residents will

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

use the VRE as a source of transportation to and from work, but others will use it... or like to live there because of its proximity to the rail station and flexibility they could have to go north when they want to. But they'll still be auto dependent. I don't think at this point in time we've seen in Stafford where we have a totally designed community where people don't have to use a car, because the Brooke UDA is probably not going to be large enough to sustain all the community facilities that people will ultimately need.

Ms. Kirkman: And then they also list a number of required road improvements that are not listed in the Comprehensive Plan as being needed for that UDA, including improvements to Andrew Chapel Road, Route 628 and Eskimo Hill Road. Have those been addressed?

Mr. Harvey: No they have not. That will be something we'll have to evaluate in the implementation part of the plan after this document is adopted.

Ms. Kirkman: And then going back to Widewater, VDOT commented that not only are there improvements that are needed in the immediate area of Widewater, but that because of the large scale of that particular Urban Development Area that you would also need improvements to Route 1 and also even an analysis of if improvements were going to be needed to the Garrisonville Road interchange. Have those needs been identified in some way regarding that UDA in the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Harvey: Not at this point.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. So, those are my questions about the VDOT comments. And then I had a question regarding Chapter 6, Mr. Hess?

Mr. Hess: Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: And that's regarding figure 6.8 on page 6-57. And that depicts major electric and gas lines and it depicts a major gas line that basically extends all the way from the southernmost border of the County all the way up to Quantico following the railroad tracks. Do you see that?

Mr. Hess: I believe so, yes.

Ms. Kirkman: And just to confirm that, I did go today to the National Pipeline Mapping System to confirm that that follows the CSX rail tracks. And can you tell me, do those rail tracks go through or adjacent to any of the UDAs?

Mr. Harvey: I can answer that question.

Ms. Kirkman: Sure.

Mr. Harvey: The rail line goes through three of the UDAs, the ones that are focused along the rail stations. You have Leeland Station in the south, Brooke Station in the middle part of the County, and then the Stafford Station in the northern part of the County. I believe that pipeline is owned and operated by a company known as Plantation Pipeline.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Yep. You can look that up too. And, I guess, was there any discussion about the potential danger that may present by building dense urban development... I mean, we did have just this past September the pipeline explosion in San Bruno, California, that killed eight people, created a billion dollars worth of property damage and, since then, both the Washington Post and the Free Lance-Star have published articles titled things like "after pipeline blast, widespread concerns", "suburban sprawl increases risk from aging infrastructure", "US gas pipelines deteriorating", "aging natural gas pipelines as risk of explosion nationwide federal official says"... was there any discussion about what it means to locate dense residential development on top of aging pipeline infrastructure?

Mr. Harvey: I don't believe there was a specific discussion. I know that there was... I would have to thumb through the plan but there was some reference to infrastructure and utilities and, if you can give me a few minutes, I'll look to see what the policies recommend in that regard.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Harvey, would it be different than what we do today in the County in regards to safety and gas lines?

Mr. Harvey: Currently there are no regulations in the County that stipulate distances from the easements for the pipeline. Someone could develop up to the edge of that easement or, if the pipeline company would allow them to put a parking lot or some other non-structure across that area, that would apply for all utilities, whether it's water and sewer, electric...

Mr. Howard: Right, but it's my point for the question is it's likely that we're following the same process that we follow today. I'm assuming that's the answer, but I'm not sure. But you can look through the wording.

Mr. Hirons: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that would be pretty easy. The question we asked is there residential development around Leeland Station currently where this pipeline is.

Mr. Howard: Right.

Mr. Hirons: The answer is probably yeah. There's a lot of pipeline spokes up around Garrisonville off 610. Is there a lot of dense residential dwellings up around that area currently?

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, my colleague doesn't seem to understand. I'm not talking about distribution lines, I'm talking about large transmission lines and that was actually the problem out in California that a thirty inch transmission line exploded and burned a crater into the ground destroying thirty-eight homes and killing eight people. And since then, a number of federal agencies have identified that building dense residential development on top of aging infrastructure just might not be a good idea. That's different than distribution lines.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Hirons: And the distribution line does go through Leeland Station, correct?

Mr. Howard: Well, I think the... not to have a debate between two Commissioners, but it's a point well taken. It certainly should be a concern and I don't believe we addressed it differently than the way it's handled today, which is what I believe to be correct in the Comp Plan.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Well, actually, the prior draft of the Comprehensive Plan did call for certain easements regarding gas transmission lines and that recommendation was deleted.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Ms. Kirkman. Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Objective 4.5 in the plan, which is on pages 2-22 through 2-23, has wording with regard to electric and pipeline utilities. The expansion should be done in a manner to minimize exposure to County residents to potential pipeline ruptures and visual impacts and environmental hazards. It talks about us mapping them, it talks about requesting the public service corporations to have their easements well marked and provide regular public education and notice to the hazards; also, identifying critical surface water and resource areas within the vicinity of the pipelines and other issues regarding electric lines. So, there's wording in the plan; there's not specific recommendations as far as stand-offs for development and that type of nature.

Mr. Howard: Right. Which I think again is similar to what's done today. But it's a good point nonetheless. Mr. Hess, were you involved directly with the VDOT review?

Mr. Hess: I was not.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Mr. Harvey, who was the person who did the VDOT review? Was it Jamie Brown-Porter?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Brown-Porter signed the letter on behalf of the District Administrator but I understand that there was several staff within the VDOT District office that contributed to the review of the document.

Mr. Howard: Did they come back with a recommendation that we should not move forward with the UDAs as they are illustrated within the draft Comp Plan?

Mr. Harvey: No sir.

Mr. Howard: Did they come back with any recommendation?

Mr. Harvey: Their memo that's provided in your document says things that we should consider with our Comp Plan. Some significant concern that VDOT had for future development was for our UDAs, along Route 1 and Route 17 in particular, they felt that we needed to be careful that we don't plan too many road access points and other measures that could potentially impose problems for the traffic flow along those major corridors.

Mr. Howard: And I thought there was a recommendation in there also post, if this were to be adopted, post adoption, working with their UDA consultant in terms of prioritizing and planning and making sure that it's a well thought out transportation plan by UDA, is that...?

Mr. Harvey: I believe that's correct.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Are there any other questions for Mr. Hess? Hearing none, I think Mr. Zuraf is back up.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Zuraf: We're in the home stretch. Computer please. We're at the recommendation. Staff does support the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan which includes the adoption of the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan Year 2010 to 2030, including the proposed Land Use Map and the repeal of the existing Land Use Plan and Map and the repeal of the existing Transportation Plan. Staff believes the plan meets the criteria specified in the State Code for Comprehensive Plans and Urban Development Areas and staff does note that the current Land Use Plan was adopted in 1988 and last amended in 2003. There were several other amendments to the current Land Use Map but the last major update of 2003 is beyond the typical five year review period, so the plan is due to be updated. The plan, staff believes, provides a solid foundation for the updating of other plan elements. As I mentioned earlier, we do have the recommendation for the adjustment to the designation for agricultural/rural areas on the Land Use Map. And in your packet is proposed Planning Commission Resolution PCR10-09 which recommends approval to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Resolution PCR10-10 recommends denial to the Board of Supervisors. As we move forward, if the Comprehensive Plan amendments are adopted, staff needs to work on development of an implementation plan. This would establish more specific actions to ensure that the goals, objectives and policies are achieved or followed. This would need to occur within ninety days of the approval. This is spelled out within Chapter 2 of the document. And also beyond that, staff would continue with the implementation of the Urban Development Areas. There are public forums that would be occurring and more detailed area planning and traffic analysis occurring in these locations. Also, there would be a need for a revision of other plan elements including the Master Water and Sewer Plan, Parks and Rec Facilities Plan, and Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Plan, just to name a few of the many plan elements that go into our overall comprehensive planning here. And on that, I will answer any additional questions that you might have.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Zuraf. Are there any additional questions from Commissioners of staff? Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, I did have one but I think probably it's more appropriate for the attorneys.

Mr. Howard: Certainly.

Ms. Kirkman: On the staff report that we received dated November 17th states that this plan has been developed in accordance with Virginia Code Section 15.2-223, but the Resolution... 2223 is about developing a Comprehensive Plan. The Resolution though refers to 15.2-2229 which is regarding amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and I'd just like to know which section of the code we are actually operating under tonight. Is it 2229 or 2223?

Mr. Taves: This is an amendment of an existing Comprehensive Plan so 2229 is what the Commission is operating under.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. Then could you explain to me, the Resolution talks about amending the Comprehensive Plan then repealing the current plan. How can we amend something that we're repealing?

Mr. Taves: You're amending the current plan and then after amending the current plan, by adding a new document. This is a whole new document. Then you'd be repealing the old document, the old Land Use Plan, the old Land Use Map and the old Transportation Plan.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Well this is sort of like a question of when you replace every board on the fence, when is it a new fence? So, really, are we amending the existing Comprehensive Plan or are we really passing a new Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Taves: Well, by definition, because you already have a Comprehensive Plan, and the Comprehensive Plan is comprised of numerous documents and only the Land Use Plan document and the Transportation Plan document are being replaced by this amendment.

Ms. Kirkman: So, all the other parts of the Comprehensive Plan still stand?

Mr. Taves: Correct.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Are there any other questions of staff? I just have a question of clarification and it's from the attorneys as well. Did you have a chance to review the Comprehensive Plan draft dated October 20, 2010, as revised by the Planning Commission at its meeting on October 20, 2010? Yes?

Mr. Taves: Yes.

Mr. Howard: Okay, is there any reason that, legal reason that you see that if there were an affirmative vote to adopt that that should not occur? From a legal perspective, is there a reason that we should not adopt this if the Commission so inclined? Or is there a reason that we should deny recommendation?

Mr. Taves: Not that I'm aware of. And I would note that both the County Attorneys' office and I have worked very closely with staff, with the Commission itself, with the Board, in developing this proposal. And so we've evaluated... there's been a lot of talk about the UDA statute and everything... we've evaluated that in pretty good detail all the way through the process; ever since I got involved. And I know Mr. Smith has been involved in that process too.

Mr. Howard: Great. Thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: I have an additional question for the consultant. You had raised with the Planning Commission a number of concerns about the ability to collect on proffers, particularly given the way that they were written in the Comprehensive Plan. You had also expressed a concern about the fact that it just lists a minimum and maximum as being the same density. Have those concerns been addressed in this draft?

Mr. Taves: I think that may be one of those issues where if the Commission wants to go into closed session and discuss those issues and that legal advice, I would be glad to do that.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Hearing... Mrs. Hazard?

Mrs. Hazard: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess just asking for... I don't want us to forget the recommendation by staff about the agricultural and rural. I don't know when you would like that to be the appropriate time to bring that forward.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: I think after the public hearing.

Mrs. Hazard: After the public hearing? Okay.

Mr. Howard: Okay, hearing no other questions of staff from the Commission, I will now open up the public hearing. And again, I just remind you, those who would like to speak may do so by stepping forward. And you need to sign your name, or write your name, on that piece of paper. And then just state your name and your address. And again, the green light goes on, you'll have three minutes to address the Planning Commission, the yellow light comes on you have about a minute left, the red light comes on and starts to flash we ask you conclude and let the next speaker begin. And again, we will not respond to you directly. At the end of this public hearing, if there are questions we can answer as a group, we will absolutely attempt to do that.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, before we begin, I just have a question. We've never asked people to sign in before that I'm aware of.

Mr. Howard: They're not signing, they're hand printing their name so we have a record. It's very difficult in the microphone and people come up and start to talk so fast. It's very, very difficult for the note taker to really capture the name.

Ms. Kirkman: So, are we going to start doing that for all public hearings now?

Mr. Howard: When there's this many people, we have done that in the past. It's a standard practice. Okay.

Mr. Palmer: Mr. Chair and members of the Planning Commission, Hamilton Palmer.

Mr. Howard: Can you just speak into the microphone a little louder.

Mr. Palmer: Hamilton Palmer. I am a landowner and tax payer in the County and I'm here tonight representing a client who has some property. It was in the Urban Services Area. It was in 2008 we submitted a preliminary plan; it was subsequently taken out of the Urban Services Area and we're in limbo right now. And we are north of one of the proposed new Urban Services Area and we're also... likely we'll have water and sewer going through our property at some time because the property to the north, which is St. Andrew's on the Potomac, is one of those several situations with water and sewer outside of the Urban Services Area. It makes no sense to us to have water and sewer go through our property and for those lots not to be able to connect to it. Some of the lots should be able to be connected if I read the 3.3.1, the Growth Management and Urban Services Area, in the last paragraph in there correctly. What I would like to do is take the ambiguity out of this would be to add the Osterman parcel, Tax Map 23, Parcel 2, to a limited water and sewer utility area. It is not going to change the density of that parcel and it would just make good sense if you have water and sewer right there to go ahead and hook up to it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Howard: Is there an issue with the light? No? Okay.

Mrs. Carlone: Ruth Carlone. No one really and truly knew anything about this. Out of 43,000 households, people were shocked and surprised. Can you hear me?

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Yes, but the light's not going on now. That's alright, keep talking Mrs. Carlone.

Mrs. Carlone: Anyway, I request the Planning Commission defer approval of the Comp Plan in general and send forward a recommendation of the same to the Board of Supervisors until Roadside and Harwell Consultants complete the study, provide recommendations, hold public informations in the targeted areas, and VDOT has done thorough review of the final proposal. Our County, the residents, are only allowed three minutes right now to speak and then three minutes more at the Board of Supervisors meeting. Many of the Comp Plan committee meetings were held in hours that none of these people can come to. I went to one at eight o'clock in the morning on a Saturday morning and, of course, families aren't going to be there; people that are involved in this and will pay the taxes on some of these improvements. Also, the combining of five UDAs was not mentioned. It wasn't in the advertised... advertisement of November 2nd nor is the infill in the 610 corridor that someone had mentioned was part of it. We must go ahead and have public participation as Spotsylvania. I received an email today from Spotsylvania in response to a query. We began potential seven areas in July through study process including public input and targeted areas narrowed to two. VDOT has not done a formal review of the proposal yet as it would be premature. We are still in the study phase and additional refinements will continue. So, please, let the consultant do its job that it's being paid for, \$225,000 worth, and allow the people to be informed. This is terribly, terribly unfair the way this is being handled. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, just a point of order. Can we pause for a moment and figure out what's going on with the lights? I see some of my fellow Commissioners shaking their heads yes.

Mr. Howard: I think they're working on that and right now we'll pause for a moment while Mrs. Baker is checking the podium. Mr. Fields and I were timing together so, in the spirit of fairness, Mrs. Carlone hit the mark exactly right.

Mr. Rhodes: (Inaudible).

Mr. Howard: Yes, there are a lot of people.

Ms. Kirkman: That's why I just thought it might be helpful for the speakers to be able to see the lights. Do we know what's the issue?

Mr. Howard: It started out working. Okay, go ahead and start Mr. Hoyt.

Mr. Hoyt: My name is William Hoyt. I'm also the Director of the Stafford SPCA and I'm here to talk about one piece of this Comp Plan that affects me and the SPCA directly, and that's the Brooke UDA. In general, I'm very supportive of the UDA concept if it's done right. I also like the fact that the Planning Commission proposes to plant many UDA seeds as not all will thrive or develop at the same pace. I also applaud the work of the new Planning Commission. I think you all have worked very hard to correct some damage that was done by the previous Commission and two of your current members who I believe sought to turn a good part of Stafford County...

Mr. Howard: You'll have to address the whole Commission please. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Hoyt: I'm sorry. When initially circulated, the UDA appeared to encompass the property currently occupied by the SPCA. Later maps show that it was excluded. My suggest is this; to include parcels 102B, which is the SPCA, parcels 102G which is Ms. Gardner, 102D which is Mr. Trainor, and 101G and H which belong to Mr. Wilson which currently occupies the East Coast Auto Body and Kent's Cars, as well as the open swath of parcel between parcels 140 and 141 east of Andrew Chapel Road. The SPCA shelter, which is a former nursing home, and Kent's Cars, which is a garage, are already existing, grandfathered and non-conforming/commercial uses already in place and they abut the UDA as currently drawn. The current UDA as is drawn completely omits them. We essentially have a couple of small odd and uncoordinated uses rubbing shoulders in what is a small block of land immediately adjoining the UDA. I think inclusion of these parcels within the UDA as you're drawing it might provide an opportunity for much deeper development pockets to clean it up, clean up the entire parcel, deal with any road, bridge or waterway issues and develop the entirety of that area in a coordinated and thoughtful fashion with buffers, green space as Ms. Kirkman points out, transportation and infrastructure considerations that aren't currently in place. I also think that a lot of the neighbors would prefer a nice corporate office park with buffers and mixed... and green space over perhaps SPCA dogs and an auto body shop. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Rollison: Nan Rollison. Stafford Station... I'm speaking out specifically against Stafford Station which is the UDA plan for the Griffis-Widewater District. Stafford Station is a bad planning model. Any basic planning manual written the last five years will tell you that. It does not preserve rural and historic areas. It is not downtown infill. It will raise taxes for Griffis-Widewater citizens. It will degrade our public water supply significantly with vast runoff. The developers who are interested in developing Stafford Station want to build five million square feet of commercial and retail space. Anywhere from 5,000 to 14,000 new homes... that's anywhere from 10,000 to 28,000 car trips a day. Who's going to pay for educating 5,000 or more new students? The developer says they will build the schools. Who will pay the teacher salaries and benefits? Who will operate the schools year after year? A water treatment center costs approximately \$6 billion to build. It costs approximately \$200,000 a year to maintain operating costs. The developers have said they will build the treatment center. Who will pay to maintain the operating costs each year? Griffis-Widewater taxpayers. A number of my neighbors in Griffis-Widewater have brought up a very interesting point. If the developers have so much money that they can build roads and schools and all the other infrastructure necessary to support a mini-city in a forest, then why aren't they going downtown and buying vacant shopping centers and rebuilding them into mixed use places, which is what good planning is about. Taxpayers are already paying to fix Chesapeake Bay; we do not need something else that is going to increase our taxes to again fix the water. This is the third time Griffis-Widewater citizens have come out in force to say "no" to high density development in Griffis-Widewater. What is it going to take to convince you and the five Supervisors who are supporting this to stay out of our district? It begs the question in the interest of transparent government operations. Just who is running Stafford County? The citizens or the developers?

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Snyder: My name is Deborah Snyder. Can everybody hear me alright?

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Snyder: Okay. I looked over the plan online and I have some concerns. I'm going to be very specific and first discuss the UDA seven, the Centerport Plan. Now, my home is not impacted but I drive on Mountain View Road a lot. And if you go to page 4-19, plans to improve Mountain View Road are very minimal considering the other day I was on the road and there was a backup on I-95 and you get trucks, you get a lot more cars going down that road. Also, in the time I have left, I just want to talk about the park and ride lots and I want to support people who have already discussed development of commercial space. If you go down 610, you will see vacant commercial space. You will see signs for thousands of square feet of vacant commercial space. And I did quick math and between the eight UDAs I just counted up roughly twenty-four million square of commercial space. People are shopping online now. I fail to see how this is going to help the County. To be continued... Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Just a reminder, you do have a minute left when the yellow light starts to go on... but it went red.

Mr. Withrow: Frank Withrow. I have a question about the VRE, the Brooke area, and the proposed building of residential areas, residential homes there. Much of that area, it seems to me, is a wetland and watershed and I would like to know what kind of environmental impact the building of in that area will have. I think it's... in addition to that I know that the proposers mentioned the number of schools that they think have to be built but I would like to have much more information on where those schools be built and how would they be paid for and operated over the years. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Dr. Fetterolf: Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, Dr. Dean Fetterolf. The Code of Virginia requires that VDOT review Comp Plans, amendments to Comp Plans and Transportation Plans. VDOT reviewed the June 17th version of the Comprehensive Plan, not the October 20th version which is before you this evening. More than 20,000 words changed in that document including the insertion of the notional Transportation Plan, Chapter 4. I question whether this is even legal. VDOT has reviewed Chapter 4 and just returned that report sometime late last week. It says the Comprehensive Plan is heavily reliant upon Route 1 to support development and redevelopment, and VDOT recommends that road be six lanes in many sections. Please, tell us which developer is going to pay to widen Route 1 to six lanes from 610 all the way to the Prince William County line. How much is that going to cost us? Can the already dysfunctional Falmouth interchange support new development? VDOT concluded for future traffic projections quote will not only strain the facility after, and I'm going to insert the word current because that's what I'm interpreting it, funded improvements but will likely overwhelm the I-95/Route 17 interchange. According to VDOT, Route 17 needs to be eight lanes or levels of service will degrade to level F... and we all know what F means... at every intersection east of International Parkway. Some of the proposed UDAs are located in close proximity to primary roads and, according to VDOT quote general incompatibility will exist if close proximity is interpreted to mean co-existence. VDOT appears to be leaning to the latter as it is looking for far more parallel infrastructure to Route 1, 17 and 95 for congestion relief. All of the new VDOT suggestions, Table 4.2 in your Comp Plan, and the whole appendix G contain no costs. Other UDAs like Widewater Station will need extensive improvements to serve the 3,250 residential units and 5.2 million square feet of commercial space. For a perspective, Central Park has 2.2 million square of leased commercial space. The combined traffic volume for residential, employees and customers will be two and a half times worse than Central Park. Some say it's only a plan and it will never happen. Spotsy UDA consultant has held four public meetings and reduced from seven to two

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

UDAs. Some of you have attended more meetings in that room on Saturday at eight a.m. You haven't told us the real cost of this plan; you aren't prepared to vote. Sprawl, crawl and taxes is all I see from this plan.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Clancy: Good evening; William Clancy, Austin Ridge Subdivision, up in the tippety-top corner of Commissioner Hazard's district. Thank you for coming to our HOA meeting the other night. I am also a member of the HOA Board of Directors but I speak for myself tonight. We are dead set against this plan in our neighborhood. Let me explain why... you heard two of my neighbors speak to it earlier tonight. This plan and the rezoning of the Brown properties are absolutely linked. The Browns have owned the property for fifteen years and they've suddenly had the inspiration to rezone seventy-three acres in the middle smack-dab of our neighborhood to commercial. In the middle of our homes they want to put in two hotels, five office buildings, a big retail box store, a movie theater, three restaurants and seven pieces of strip mall, all in a high-end development. And they're doing it and they told us they were doing it when they came to our first Board of Directors meetings because the Comprehensive Plan clarifies the use of the land as commercial and it removes the last impediment to refusing a rezoning change. You heard earlier tonight about the AG's finding that we cannot refuse rezoning on the basis of an infrastructure shortfall. The only thing we have left is to refuse it because it doesn't comply with the Comprehensive Plan; but now it does once you all approve this. And we will have a fait accompli rezoning and seventy-three acres of commercial property smack dab in our neighborhood within a few short days or weeks of the approval of this master plan. It's not right. The people in the neighborhood bought here, we built our homes... hundreds of feet of this commercial property abut homes. People thought agricultural meant agricultural, not business residential or business retail. That's not what they bought into. This plan is not right. Any plan that has that kind of flaw in it that would let that kind of thing be done to a neighborhood over the objections of the people that live there is fundamentally flawed and cannot be approved. Send it back to staff, tell them to get it right, tell them to get some input from the public and then bring forward something that works. We all want commercial property in the town, we just don't want it smack dab in the middle of residential communities that have already been developed. Thank you for listening.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. VDOT was at the commuter lots yesterday and today, and I went up to each one of them and I told them to build a vertical property garage that you deeply need and quit building more commuter lots across our horizontal land. I'm in the Rock Hill District and I own a storm pond, so I hope your sewer service area takes care of it. Now let me give you some of my twenty years' experience in this County and let me tell you about developers; they do give you proffers. I owned a townhouse off of Eustace Road for twenty years and here's what they proffered to the County. A storm pond that 107 townhouse owners took care of while other subdivisions within this County who are not members of a corporation got to use the storm ponds for free. As a matter of fact, Wawa floats their water right down there, as well as Meadows Farms. Townhouses and condos are one of the key aspects that I know all about. And condominiums, you all talk about health, safety and welfare. Well, let me tell the citizens here twenty-eight years ago, we still don't get a water bill in Stafford Meadows. And there's thirty-three other subdivisions in this County that don't get a water bill. Now, why can't I come here and drop my water bill off in here? Why is some HOA reselling County water? This plan is completely incomplete foundation. Just like the man before me said, send it back to staff and get it right. You all have your own ideas and you keep using the word I think this is

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

the answer. The word think is subjective. You're dealing with our lives. We need to be objective. Those UDAs, especially along the VRE, the Very Rotten Experience, if you don't ride on the end of the line, you don't get a seat. That's reality. And if you think you're gonna go in Brooke Point that's zoned agricultural and you're gonna put in water and sewer, don't forget to send them a water bill. Good try. You know, I've got twenty years' experience. These developers may not say that they're giving you proffers; yes they are, indirectly. It's all about economics folks and someone is padding someone's pocket here. So, I'm all for planning, I'm all for change, but there's a lot of empty buildings out there. And you need to quit paving over this County and making it the City of Stafford, because then we're going to need a mayor and you'll all be on City Councils. Have a Happy Thanksgiving.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Woodson: Good evening. My name is Bob Woodson. I've been a resident of Stafford County for over twenty-five years. And I'm here tonight representing the citizens of Stafford and the residents of Widewater. The proposed Comprehensive Plan before you tonight could bring more than 14,000 new residential units and more than seven million square feet of commercial development to the Widewater Peninsula. We're talking about more than double the number of housing units currently in the City of Fredericksburg and more than three times the amount of commercial space currently in Central Park. The plan proposes to change most of Widewater from rural agricultural land use to suburban urban development land use. Developers would make money; citizens would be left with a mess. The proposal to build a city on Widewater was adopted over my opposition and the objections of the Widewater Planning Commissioner. I am here tonight to again express my opposition to the plan and to put Urban Development Areas in rural areas of the County. How many times will Widewater citizens have to come out and tell the Planning Commission, tell the Board of Supervisors, tell the developers that they do not want a city on the Peninsula Widewater. The citizens came out and said no when Dominion Power and other developers proposed a massive water-based community in the 1980's. The citizens again said no when Garrett Development Corporation hired a premier company to try out stunning designs of urban development at multiple committee meetings. And when these efforts failed, Garrett hired a public relations firm for advice and began courting local, regional and state leaders during lunches held at his Garrisonville headquarters. But again, they said no. So, I'm here tonight to ask you to respect the residents of Widewater, the Widewater Planning Commissioner and myself, the elected representative of Widewater and remove the Widewater UDA from the Comprehensive Plan. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure out why citizens are being ignored and developers are being listened to. I refused to accept campaign donations from developers so I could act independently and speak honestly about the disaster that is currently being planned for Widewater. In contrast, my majority colleague accepted substantial amounts of developer money and so did the Committee which they are members of. They listen to developers and not citizens. If the plan to build a city on Widewater is approved by the majority on the Board, money will have talked and citizens will have been silenced. It would be a shameful, and I repeat, shameful tragedy that would have negative consequences for this County for years. But there's still time to stop it. Tonight you can go on record with your vote. Do you represent the voices of citizens or the interest of developers? Again, I urge you to protect the interest of citizens and remove the Widewater/Stafford Station UDA from the Comprehensive Plan. Thank you.

Ms. Brown: Hi, my name is Pat Brown. I represent the John Adams' Patriots, the local Tea Party Group, and our concerns are based on the principals of preserving individual liberty and property rights. We've recently become aware of something called Agenda 21, which is a United Nations

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Initiative. It comes from an International Environmental Treaty that was never approved by the U.S. Senate and Agenda 21 Initiatives were imposed on us by President Clinton via Executive Order. We encourage everyone in Stafford County to go on the internet and read up on this because the end goal of Agenda 21 is to eliminate property ownership worldwide and to squeeze human beings onto the smallest land footprint possible. This is where the idea of the Urban Development Area comes from which is in Virginia Code 15.2-2223.1. We object to the following things: we object to Washington, D.C. and Richmond telling us how to zone our land in Stafford County, we object to this language I found in Chapter 2 entitled Environment which says “our decision to occupy and alter Stafford County’s landscape has resulted in increased volumes and concentrations of specific pollutants...” etcetera. But what does that mean, “our decision to occupy and alter Stafford County’s landscape”? I mean, it almost sounds like human beings are an intrusion on the earth. And we don’t think that the County should be telling residents here that we’re an intrusion on the property. We also question the meaning of Chapter 2, Policy 5.2.2 and request a clarification on this. It says “identify publicly owned properties that could be redeveloped as public housing for public employees”. So, we don’t understand what that means. Is that somewhere down the road we’re going to be providing housing for public employees? Third point... we enthusiastically approve of the assertion of this statement which is in Policy 1.1.7 which says “this Plan should be implemented with respect to and in consideration of private property rights”. We’re glad that’s in there. Although I’d ask that maybe you change the sentence to read “this Plan must be implemented with respect to and in consideration of private property rights”. So, given what we now know about this Agenda 21 Initiative, we tend to favor the spreading out of the density of future population rather than cramming people into the smallest possible footprint, because then we will turn into a city. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Domie: My name is Helene Domi. Good evening. I have lived in Stafford for forty years. My dad retired from the Marine Corps and settled here when I was in the fifth grade. I graduated from Stafford High School. Now I’ve settled here with my family and I truly love it here. As you can imagine, I have seen a lot of growth in Stafford over forty years, but I have never seen anything like what is going on right now. I have spent countless hours going over this Comprehensive Plan. Now, I consider myself a reasonably intelligent person and I’m completely overwhelmed, and I applaud all of you for understanding that plan at all. But what I do get is I vote no way. Do you all realize that the citizens of your district do not even know that there is something a Comprehensive Plan? All that the average Helene citizen knows is that the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission are fighting over something again because we read it in the Free Lance-Star. This plan is supposed to, and I quote, “guide and accomplish coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the County and also best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare of the inhabitants”. So let me ask you this... why has the pro-business agenda been changed to pro-residential? Because we all know that residential development does not pay for itself; we do. Why eight UDAs? Why not one? Why are we still waiting for the \$225,000 transportation study results? I don’t know if you’re aware of it but transportation is pretty bad right now as it is. Where is the citizen input on this? When are the public hearings where each plan is presented and explained in a non-partisan manner? Now, my kids received their report cards today from school and if I had to grade this group project, on the plan itself, on the presentation to the citizens, and on the reviews from your classmates, you’d get an F. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Niewold: Hello, my name is Laura Niewold. I guess I live in Southern Gateway. It has been Hartwood but it's Southern Gateway now and it has been becoming Southern Gateway for about the past ten years. And I like it. We are well on the way to being a legitimate UDA. Over the last ten years of me living there, I've watched Stafford Lakes be added to the already existing areas like Cardinal Forest, Rocky Run Subdivisions, more rural subdivisions off of Holly Corner Road, and the traffic just with the Stafford Lakes on Route 17 from Geico to get to 95 has become horrendous. And we're practically a UDA now. I always have the argument with my husband, whenever something new goes in, "oh lookit, look at our wonderful UDA, everybody's walking there, everybody's umm travelling together on their bikes and getting there". But no, everyone is getting in their car, they're getting on 17, they're not walking to Walmart, they're going to Central Park because we can't... we don't have the services. What we need and what I hope the Planning Commission can give us are the following things there and we can become the first successful UDA and show the rest of the County, because I am all for the concept. We need shopping other than Walmart and Target. We do need real shopping. We need entertainment and we need a high school, because all of the high school students are driving all the way, every day, all the way up to Colonial Forge and it is dangerous. That is my main concern; the traffic and just the crowdedness and the way that it's not working. It's just not working having people walk to their stores and get around. Maybe it's too big. My other concern is how will this new Comprehensive Plan actually improve the pedestrian, biking and walking access in the County? That is the wave of the future; walking around in a healthy community. And I don't see how the plan is even putting this into any part of the new UDAs. So, if you can address that in the next plan or the next workup of it, that would be wonderful because I do think that it is a possibility it can work. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Callander: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Commission members, my name is Bruce Callander. I live in Falmouth on a small property that is not directly impacted by a UDA. However, since moving to Falmouth in 1980, I have commuted to Ft. Belvoir up Interstate 95 or US 1, depending on the particular day and where the bottlenecks are festering or the accidents are happening. The time for my drive was at one time forty-five minutes, back in 1980. It's now anywhere from an hour and a half to two and a half hours. The dramatic commuter population growth in Stafford during that time has contributed to the traffic of, course, and, from what it looks like you are planning to allow enough houses here for three times what the forecasters say we will need, increasing the load on an already strained road system. Just last night the County Board was discussing the difficulty of acquiring funding for improvements to the Route 17 corridor. The residential development that's proposed here will not pay for itself. It will not pay to make these highway improvements. And the developers will pay for as little as they can get away with. We're going to be paying through our noses to provide schools and services for all those people. They'll start building houses and hope commercial comes to support it but you can't be sure how things will work out. It's true, you'll be creating... whoops, excuse me, rewind. I support the concept of Urban Development Areas where, theoretically, people will be walking to work and the store and supposedly they'll be out of the main roads less often. However, I do have a concern about the planned UDAs... how the planned UDAs will impact the main corridors in Stafford and how the roads within the UDAs or leading to them will be funded. Even if developers help pay for the roads, don't count on them covering all of the associated costs. Finally, UDAs should not be put in the plan until the \$200,000 Department of Transportation UDA consulting firm has made its recommendations, even if that means asking the state for more time. Thank you very much.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. McMath: Good evening, I'm Jim McMath. This plan is not a transparent document that clearly and accurately reflects the possible consequences of its use. Two things have been deleted from the revision that caused this subterfuge. First, there is no build-out table showing the maximum possible residential units allowed by the proposed Land Use Map. And second, there is no fiscal analysis showing the impact of that level of residential development. Without this information, the citizens of Stafford have no way of knowing what impact the proposed plan will have on them in the future. This is gross negligence that is not remedied by the recent study performed by Dr. Fuller. That study compared commercial industrial growth as build-out to the projected growth for the residential units. The implication... the implied assumption was that the latter were also build-out numbers, otherwise the study would have been comparing apples to oranges. That this was Dr. Fuller's intent is confirmed by his statement that the analysis would calculate "the net fiscal effects for each different type of land use that is added to the current stock of land uses over the build-out period of the Comprehensive Plan". For the Fuller study to be an accurate analysis of this plan's fiscal impact, the plan's residential build-out would have to be no more than the projected growth of 30,000 units. But the missing build-out table clearly shows that is not what the plan allows. The actual residential build-out number, according to the table prepared by the Planning Department, is over 91,000 additional units, or three times the projected level used in this plan. Ironically, that contradicts the goal indicated in the memorandum to you dated this date. I quote from the top page in the middle of the paragraph where it says "policies include limiting potential residential growth on the Land Use Map to reflect the projected population over the next twenty years". The operative word there is "potential". My Webster dictionary defines it as something that can develop or become actual. That, ladies and gentlemen, is what a build-out is; the residential development that can take place over the planning period. Dr. Fuller says that can be no more than 30,000 units for the plan to be sustainable. If you adopt this plan without showing how much residential development it would actually allow and without providing a fiscal impact analysis for that level of projected growth, you will be asking the citizens of Stafford to blindly follow you into the future. Why are you doing this? Why are you proposing a plan that allows three times more residential growth than is projected to occur and not telling us what the financial impact of that level of growth would be?

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Beiler: David Beiler. I'm a former County Supervisor and hold a degree in urban planning. I have nothing but questions so and you only give me three minutes so you'll have to run through them and then you can come back at some point and answer them if you want to. This Comprehensive Plan provokes many serious questions. First, why did the proposed previous passed by this Commission last year provide several sessions for public education and input before the formal hearings, while this new and radically different plan provided none? Why does this plan proposed the creation of two new mini cities miles beyond existing utility lines? Why does this plan provide for three times the residential growth state law requires us to provide for? Why does this plan provide for fifty-nine percent more new residential growth in Urban Development Areas than state law allows? Why did the author of this plan, Mr. Sterling, go before a Committee of the General Assembly just this past Monday, three days ago... two days ago, and ask for permission to join five of these proposed Urban Development Areas into one monster UDA using inter-lying areas of light industrial zoning? That act alone provokes several more questions. If this plan still isn't finished, why are you being forced to vote on it this week? It's not due to go to the state for seven and a half months. Why is the father of this plan pushing for a massive new city centered on the airport? Is it because he is the lead lobbyist in

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Washington for the aerospace industry? What does he know about the future of our airport that we don't and why isn't he telling us? If you can answer these questions, you should share those answers with the people of Stafford. And if you cannot answer them, you should not be voting for this plan.

Ms. Muller: Good evening. Can you hear me?

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Ms. Muller: My voice is a little hoarse, excuse me. My name is Linda Muller. I am speaking and sharing my experience as an active member in the Rappahannock Sierra Club as well as an active member in the Virginia Conservation Network. Urban Development Areas mean an area designated by a locality that is appropriate for higher density development due to proximity to transportation facilities, availability of public water and sewer systems, developed areas, redevelopment or infill development. It is important to understand why these five qualities are recommended for UDAs. Now the Virginia Conservation Network, in supporting smart growth organizations, supported UDA legislation as a means to reduce the rapid loss of rural lands, loss of natural, historic and cultural resources, to help reduce harmful pollution and to improve quality of life, among other things. It is safe to suffice that placing an Urban Development Area in undeveloped ecologically sensitive land that is poised along the Potomac River that is part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is not what conservationists envisioned as an appropriate location for a UDA. Of course, I am referring to the UDA proposed in Widewater, also known as Stafford Station. The proposed Brooke and Stafford Station/Widewater are currently without water and sewer and are in green fields. The actual description of the additional infrastructure and capital costs required for additional UDAs negate the entire concept and purpose of urban developed areas. And this is taken directly from the proposed Comprehensive Plan. The existing Widewater Road is not sufficient to meet the increased traffic volume that Stafford Station would bring to the peninsula. Therefore, a four-lane divided road would need to be constructed between Jefferson Davis Highway and the new town center. And then, of course, a new commuter rail station and a thousand park and ride lot would need to be built. It will be necessary to reduce increased traffic volumes on Route 1, I-95 and nearby interchanges. Centerport... getting the residents of Centerport to and from work in other destinations without creating an undue hardship on them and other residents of Stafford County and the Commonwealth of Virginia, it would be necessary to provide more adequate transportation facilities. You'll have to create additional roads to bring people to and fro from the UDA in order to distribute the traffic volume. Furthermore, a transit facility, including a thousand space park and ride lot as well as a commuter van pool and bus transit station, will need to be completed to reduce increased vehicle volumes. You get the idea. More road construction, impact on wetlands and traffic congestion, removal of green spaces, additional loss of tree canopy, impact on wetlands and additional encroachments on the Chesapeake Bay through increases of non-point source pollution from high density development runs counter to the spirit and intent of the UDAs. I urge this Board to vote to defer this plan; UDAs are an effective way of managing sprawl. I think the Courthouse area is a good example. So I ask that you vote no or defer this plan this evening. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Kurpiel: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Patricia Kurpiel. I do want to say before I start that I do support compact development but I do not support this plan. As a matter of fact, I am going to urge you to vote no tonight. My topic tonight is pretty simple. It's about build-out. There is no build-out chart in this plan. Why not? This is a major shortcoming

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

and you are doing the citizens a disservice. You must be afraid that the citizens will not support this plan if they know the whole story. Build-out is one of the most important documents of a Comprehensive Plan whether or not it is required by law. The build-out tells the supply of potential residential units. The VEC calculated demand for twenty years at 30,000 new residential units. We have a preliminary build-out prepared by the Planning Department which shows 91,000 units are being made available to meet that demand. That chart has been suppressed and the public cannot see it in the Comprehensive Plan. When you add that 91,000 units to the 43,000 units that already exist here, we're talking about total housing in Stafford at build-out of 134,000 units. A 91,000 unit supply against a 30,000 unit demand; why? Why? Why are you providing three times the number that is needed to meet the forecasted demand? But 91,000, ladies and gentlemen, is understated. That is based on ten units... ten dwelling units per acre using TND legislation. Developers could choose other zoning that is currently available on your books. And that could turn out to be fifteen dwelling units per acre in the UDA. And that would turn out to be 114,000 new units. And there are even more. When you run water and sewer out to the tip of Widewater and to the rail at Brooke, you open up even more vacant land. And so I'm asking you... do you have a legal defense to deny rezoning requests along those lines? Thirty thousand demand, 91,000 supply could turn out to be 114,000... do you have a legal defense for even more? This proposal is nothing more than an over-commitment of land for UDAs and the overall projected growth and it is not in the best interest of citizens. And I have two questions for you. Would you please speak to the Supervisor's request before a General Assembly Subcommittee this week about what the implication will be of removing light industrial or adding... remove light industrial from UDAs and combining five UDAs into one. And how will...

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kurpiel, there are a lot of people behind you and you went over.

Ms. Kurpiel: Thank you sir.

Mr. Howard: Thank you very much.

Ms. Davis: Good evening, my name is Natalie Davis. Members of the Commission, thank you for your service. You do a difficult and thankless job, so thank you. As you make these difficult decisions with the Board of Supervisors, please think of the people who count; our children and our grandchildren. They are going to live in the world that we're creating. I can only imagine what a child might ask here tonight. Children do ask difficult questions, perhaps questions like these: why did you spend our money, our \$800,000 and have plan that people like before redevelopment areas, and now why are you ignoring it? Why are you talking about building eight of these little city things when the big guys in Richmond are not requiring that many and the four that you studied would be best? Why don't you tell everybody that your new plan will make a place where there will be 91,000 more new houses? I understand big numbers like that. And are you really going to let them build a McDonald's on that trail where we hike and count the birds? Yesterday we counted eight different kinds of birds there. Where will the birds go? Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Stone: My name is Helen Stone. I've lived in Aquia Harbor for over thirty years. Now, when we went to (inaudible) at Aquia Harbor, there was very limited pavement on the roads and there were many, many beautiful birds, beautiful animals. We even had a big ol' bear in our street at one point. We had to run while the kids were waiting for their bus to go to school we were racing out to try to catch them so that they wouldn't pat the big ol' bear. Now, we've lost a lot of birds, we've lost a lot of

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

our animals and, in fact, this has become a really, really expensive place to live. And a lot of people cannot afford that. And we are not in a little recession, we are in a depression, as bad as the thirties. And that has been acknowledged not just in this state but in many states. The only people who are prospering apparently are the people who work up in D.C. And they've forgotten that they work for us, not we work for them. And this is what's happening in this particular area. We are getting a lot of urban sprawl; we cannot afford any more. The amount of money that this proposal says and I want us to fight this urban sprawl in Stafford. And it's going to be... the way that this is being projected, it is being very expensive. And if you look down in Stafford on Route 610, Garrisonville Highway, you will see store after store that is closing or they are trying to sell things at incredibly low prices. Now this is not a recession, it is a depression and for this to happen and increase taxes and then get the sprawl... and who's going to pay for all this? We are. And in order to do that, guess what? Taxes are going to go through the roof. Now you need to listen to us because if you don't we will vote you all out. And that needs to be done and I think you need to look very carefully at some of these proposals that you have put in. Thank you very much.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Reed: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Becky Reed. I'm a former County Supervisor and was when the Comp Plan was last updated. I urge you to reject this proposed Comp Plan on the grounds that we do not need a supply of residential units that exceeds the Virginia Employment Commission's projected need of 30,000 units. The supply calculated by Planning is 91,000 new units. And I'm not saying that the 91,000 could be built without further action by the Planning Commission and the Board. It's long been understood that the provision of water and sewer are residential growth drivers. Look at how far water and sewer would need to be extended to reach Widewater and the Brooke areas and the rail stations. I'm concerned about the land in between. What legal tools do you have to reject the rezoning requests for parcels in between the UDAs and existing development after the water and sewer has been run? If you do not wish to approve a rezoning for these in between areas, can you legally reject it? What grounds will you use? One authority noted and quoted in the Chesapeake Bay Handbook says "if a rezoning applicant can show that the locality has approved a similar rezoning request on similarly situated property, the court may require that the locality grant the rezoning based on principles of equal protection". In Virginia the containment of the utility lines is the most effective way of controlling growth. Please do not compromise Stafford's legal defenses by flinging them across the countryside as this plan proposes to do. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Thomas: Good evening, I'm Linda Thomas. I had prepared a statement tonight but I'm not going to repeat what a lot of the people ahead of me have already said. But I just will say this... I've lived in the County for thirty-one years and seen many hassles over various subdivisions as they've come along, various pros and cons to those subdivisions. And I've got to say this plan is the granddaddy of them all. We could live with a little subdivision on this road and one over here, but this one takes the whole I-95/Route 1 corridor which is already just impassible. And I would recommend that you listen to the citizens because I've seen one situation in particular that's very dear to my heart where the citizens turned out to be right. And that was Ferry Farm. If you go to Stafford County's website and click on visitors, you'll see that the leading tourist attraction for Stafford County is Ferry Farm, George Washington's boyhood home. Fifteen years ago the Board of Supervisors was going to allow Walmart to build one of their box stores on all of Ferry Farm except for a few acres. And it would have

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

happened had it not been for a public outcry and a tremendous effort to save the farm. And just within the last two years archaeologists found the foundation for the Washington home at Ferry Farm. Can you imagine the travesty if we had lost that historical treasure to being paved over with a Walmart parking lot? So, I hope you will listen to the citizens because sometimes we know what we're talking about. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Heinrichs: Good evening, my name is Lisa Heinrichs. There are several things that are wrong with this. One thing I would like to address, in the appendix, under the cultural... of course I can't find the page now. Anyway, in here it does say "additional issues participants cited as important to the planning process included concern that the County is underfunded and understaffed to address important issues, that a commuter and military culture have eroded community understanding and ownership need for..." I think that says the military commuter or the military culture has eroded community understanding and ownership. As a homeowner here in Stafford County I would like to say that in no way has my being married to the military undermined the fact that this is my first home. This is where our first child is actually getting to go to middle school and high school. I do take ownership in this community. My husband is working with sports, we attend church here, I attend as many of these functions as I can. I am offended by the fact that the military culture is eroding away the community understanding and ownership. As Quantico is right up the road, I think it would be hard to say that Stafford would be able to somehow disassociate themselves from the military community. I would also like to take issue with wording such as "global climate change" that I see in here. People are wondering where this all came from. Things like so-called big picture items; climate change and global warming. That is what I believe is driving this. People are asking, the citizens are saying you know, you're not listening to us, you're listening to the developers. I personally believe that you guys, maybe some of you aren't even aware of where some of these things that are being put down on you by the state are coming from. And again, it's coming from the Agenda 21 mandate that was signed in 1992. This is not something that the County of Stafford is trying to force on its citizens. This is something that the County of Stafford is trying to comply to. It is an agenda that is set out for population... for the entire... population zones for the entire world that the United States has signed onto. So, if you want to point fingers and ask where this is coming from, our National Parks are now owned by the U.N.; forty-seven of them. Things are changing. This is not some Sterling plan. This isn't the Brown family trying to make a bunch of money. This is much bigger and I hope that you guys will look into the Agenda 21 and that we can find some way to get rid of it. I don't know that that can happen. In that case, we are going to have to find a way to live in it. And good luck.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Larus: Elizabeth Larus. The plan is flawed because the whole concept of UDAs is flawed, and for the precise reason that it will cost... it will increase the price of housing in the area, both in rural and urban areas. Before coming to this meeting this evening, I read over the plan. And what caught my eye in particular was this statement about sustainable development, the necessity for sustainable development. Sustainable development is economic growth and development that meets the needs of the current population, but also protects the needs for future populations. What is the origins of this term? The origins of the term sustainable development is the Brundtland Commission of the 1970s, a U.S. Commission based on the premise that resources are finite and therefore we must protect resources. If you remember the seventies, there was a tremendous concern with population growth and Malthusians were still quite influential in the U.N. at the time. The idea was you preserve undeveloped

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

land, rural and agricultural land, and you corral people into urban areas. That's how you protect finite resources. What's the deal in Stafford? Seventy percent of Stafford County is still rural. Why the need, why the particular need for these UDAs? So, what in fact has happened with the concept of UDAs worldwide? Go over to the third world where in many countries today governments are removing indigenous people from their land and corralling them into cities, all in the name of sustainable development. That is the government saying to the indigenous people we need to set this land aside and we are the better stewards of the land than the people who have been there for centuries. So, go ahead and go live in the cities and we will take the land. So, therefore, you have government doing essentially the same thing in Northern Virginia, in California... look at Loudoun County. The government set aside land not to be developed and then corrals people into urban areas. What has happened? The price of housing has gone up in rural areas as well as urban areas. Look at the price of housing in Loudoun, look at it in California. You talk about there being a minimum of about, what, four acres per house out in rural areas. No developer is going to build a cheap affordable house in rural areas on four acres. They're going to build a big house that people with lots of money can buy. Prices are going to go up in urban areas as well because we're all going to be living on top of each other. That land will be sold at a premium. Again, look at the urban areas. Look at Fredericksburg. Land there sells there for a premium because it is limited and that's because under this plan you're setting aside too much rural area. The plan is flawed. Turn it down. Thanks.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Dixon: Good evening and greetings to you all. My name is Rebecca Dixon. I'm very concerned about this plan that you have. I only found out about it when I went to do my citizen's duty and vote. My Supervisor was handing out these information sheets and I had no idea. My husband works in Washington, D.C. It takes him two and a half hours to get to work and come back. We don't have time to enjoy a Free Lance-Star. We had no opportunity... my husband and I lived in the same house for twenty years. We didn't buy a McMansion. We love Widewater. I go to Aquia Episcopal Church and I also am a member of that church. We have Clifton Chapel down off Widewater Road. These are historical landmarks. They're national landmarks. And you're going to destroy that kind of environment by doing any kind of dense development in the Widewater Peninsula. It is not acceptable. Turn this down. That area is a wooded area. It still has pristine areas of creeks and streams. I live there; I know what I'm talking about. My husband sees deer come up our back yard. The guy that lives behind us has a multiple acre farm. He's going to end up developing that if you all do this plan. There is not... it's not a good plan. Stafford County butts Prince William County. I gave up a really good job in Northern Virginia because the commute was killing me. It was really affecting me. So I took a lower paying job to work locally here and I can tell you right now, my military... I'm a retired... my husband's a retired... I'm a veteran in the United States Navy and my colleagues, my associates and my friends that are military that come here and live three years and then they go away, they're buying homes in Spotsylvania County and some of them even in Thornburg, and way out, almost to Culpeper, to be able to afford a house. They can't afford a house in Stafford County. And you're going to develop something that's going to be so much more expensive. This is not a good plan. What happened to Aquia Town Center? That was going to be a mixed use place. Some of it's just a bunch of rubble. Any of the shops I used to shop at, the Rite Aid is about the only one there. There's no fitness center there. Everything is on 610. What about all the properties on 610 that are sitting empty that other people talked about here? I have attended previous meetings for this very same development in Widewater. It is wrong; it was wrong before. But, at least before we had a public forum to come to. I wouldn't have known about this. My husband is very upset that that Centerpoint thing was developed; you spent, I don't know, millions of dollars on that. A hundred and

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

fifty or five hundred cars drive on that a day. Falmouth is a nightmare, you know; it's terrible. And I'm really upset with what you all are doing. And you are going to affect the deer, the fox, the things that we see and we cherish. And I'm just done with this sprawl and crawl. I'm just really done with it. Please vote no. Listen to the people that are before you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Dixon: I've got twenty-six seconds.

Mr. Howard: When the red light flashes, the time has concluded. Thank you.

Mr. Nance: Thank you all for having me. My name is Jason Nance. I am a United States Air Force Gulf war vet, Verizon DSL technician retiree due to injury and currently a disabled member of Stafford County. I have a couple of objective points I came to talk subjective as former members of the community suggested. Start with in what positive manner...manners will the proposed developments have on the intrinsic personal values most if not all residents already possess. Please do not allow whichever way you decide, do not at all allow Stafford County to become any semblance of Ferry Farm. If the developed area makes Central Park dwarfed in comparison how will local residents not be smothered literally and figuratively? That is all I have to say. Thank you very much.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mrs. Callander: Good evening, I am Alane Callander. I have been observing Stafford planning activities for about twenty years now and frankly as others here I am very disturbed at the process that has brought us to this latest version of the comp plan. The Commissioners up until today with only two exceptions have accepted the direction of some members of the Board of Supervisors like soldiers in an army. That is not why we have Planning Commissions. I am glad there is good involvement of citizens tonight because the comp plan is supposed to make the community better for them. If developers along the way benefit, that is fine. But we are getting a strong indication that it is the developers who are carrying way too much influence. If you pass this plan with eight urban development areas or however many without input from the consultant that was hired to recommend areas suitable, then that is plain and simple poor planning. We have already seen enough poor planning in this county. I am concerned about the process of decision making and basic logic. I want planning that improves our quality of life and opportunities. It is logical to protect the property value of the citizen who own homes here rather than build too many new homes that will negatively impact their home values. It is logical not to build housing near a noisy airport. If Quantico can tell us where to put housing why can't the citizens of our county? It is not logical to put an Urban Development Area all the way out on the Widewater peninsula even if there is a train there...train track there. What does the developer want to do? Build a new Annapolis? This plan is nowhere near ready to go to the Board of Supervisors. I would like to offer special thanks to the dedicated citizen comp plan scholars, the skilled watchdogs who do data analysis and keep tabs on pertinent laws for our benefit. Please do not send this to the Board of Supervisors. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Harvey: Computer please.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mrs. Hilliard: My name is Kandy Hilliard. I am asking you to vote no on this comp plan. Until Mr. Athey's General Assembly sub-committee can be asked for Quantico credit. As Mr. Sterling stated to the sub-committee fifty-one percent, and this is the slide he used in his presentation, that fifty-one percent of Stafford is incompatible for Urban Development Areas because of the Marine Corp Base Quantico impacts. This is the slide that he used. Stafford is already over zoned. By that I mean current by-right zoning exceeds the Virginia Employment Commission forecast for twenty years of growth. We have enough by-right supply to satisfy the demands for twenty years without any UDAs at all, period. This plan builds out at ninety one thousand two hundred and twenty five new units per the September 10th Planning Department memo to the Planning Commission or more, if rezoning is granted. Our elected officials have no appetite for downzoning, that would move development out of our rural areas and put it near transportation and other infrastructure where it belongs, based on that UDAs will not make any difference as to rural development. There is no money for purchase of development rights and perhaps rightly so since our citizens are already paying five percent of their tax dollars for land use. And that is every year. Transfer of development rights seems attractive but you realize that Stafford already has form based code that allows ten dwelling units, where is the incentive for developers to go out and secure transfer of development rights. The incentive could lie in density bonuses for developers, but then you are asking the public to bear the seventy five thousand dollar per unit bonus for every unit that is a bonus. The bottom line for citizen tax payers is dismal. And we do not even know the real full extent of the impact since you have hidden the build out figures and refused a comprehensive financial impact analysis. Taxpayers will pay for infrastructure for by-right development in the agricultural areas as well as the incremental cost for services that always exceed income in both ag areas and UDAs. I can't imagine a worse scenario for the people paying the bills in Stafford. But it could be better. Mr. Sterling told the General Assembly Committee that fifty one percent of our county cannot be considered for UDAs due to interference with the Marine Corp operations at Quantico. Our two best areas for UDS, Route 610 and Boswells Corner have been eliminated. Why didn't Sterling... why didn't Mr. Sterling as the General Assembly for a fifty one percent credit for UDA units or seven thousand units? I understand that Chairman Athey thought the Quantico situation was quite unique, to use his words. I ask you to vote no on this comp plan. Go back to the General Assembly and give them the full story as I have given you here. Ask for Quantico credit. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Dawkins: Hi, my name is Donna Dawkins. I walked in here just to hear what was going on and to you know, find out for myself. And I wasn't going to come up here and speak, but you know what, there is nothing about this plan that has any common sense in it at all. You know, it is like where is reality. You all are going to be building a UDA at Brooke rail station with no water, sewer and you are going to run it right past my house and say no lady you can't have it. You know, not that I really want it I would rather live the way I am right now. You know you are bringing down all that stuff and it just seems like you want to put all this other stuff in Widewater. And everybody here had a very great, you know, point. You know if you are going to work on Stafford's growth I think what you need to do is fix the problems that we have now. You know we have, last year we had the big disaster with the SPCA. You all don't have an animal shelter to work with. You know you don't have any parks and recs for the kids to play. If I knew what this county had to offer when I bought my house here, I would have never moved here. You all need to fix your problems first before you decide to go build bigger and greater things. Fix the roads, fix the services. You know these people, we pay good taxes and you can't even walk anywhere like they said, there is no biking trails, there is no...and now you want to

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

add all this sprawl and crawl. It is just ridiculous. We need to work with what we have now. Fix it and then we can worry about growing later. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Grotenrath: Jack Grotenrath. Me and my wife moved down here about three years ago. I remember asking the people that we bought from, much older than ourselves, why are you moving? And they said the congestion. And that was three years ago. What the hell are we doing now? That is a good question. I know me and my wife, my wife works in D.C., she loves the perspective. The one thing about perspective is you can look up at night and you can see the stars because there is not too many lights here. Try that in Woodbridge, try that more north. We came from Maryland, the bankrupt state. I was glad to move to Virginia, very proud to be here and I like this county. Stafford seems very nice and I would like to say I hope it stays that way. I really do. UDAs, who is telling us to do this? Who is telling us to do a UDA? I keep asking the question to the crowd, I have asked several people. Oh in it mandated by the State. Okay, well who told the State to do it? And I hear something about Agenda 21 by the UN. It wants to crowd in people. I don't know how relative this link is or not, but I never heard anyone tonight out of anyone here or the people that were proposing this, I don't know who said we need to do the UDAs. That is a good question, I would like to know. Where are they coming from, his eyebrows moved, he wants to know too. I want to know, I think most of the crowd in here wants to know. Who is telling us in Stafford that we have to do this? I like living in the state, I like living in this county because again I can see the stars and I can get away from the D.C. hassle and all the other stuff. I like, I have a two and a half acre lot, I love it and no, that does not make me a criminal. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Hopkins: Hello, my name is Robert Hopkins. When I first heard about the comp plan being started I was excited, I was happy, I was very hopeful. After looking at it a little harder, I am not as hopeful. The UDA plans appear to be designed to see how much gridlock can be achieved in this county. Until and unless the only north/south corridors, in case you are wondering that is 95 and Route 1, are able to flow freely all these proposals will cause is even more gridlock then we already have. Take for example the Brooke, Leeland and Eskimo UDAs. You have locked up all of the area between those areas. What route will the garbage trucks take to go to the landfill? Route 1 to Eskimo Hill Road? No that will be gridlock by UDA. Brooke Road to Eskimo Hill Road? No gridlock by UDA. Leeland to Potomac Run to Eskimo Hill? No another gridlock by UDA. I had hoped that the work being done for this project would improve land use in this county, but if the people who presented this plan are as competent in planning as they were is providing a clear presentation using graphics and maps, we are in deep trouble. One speaker gave the presentation a grade of F, she was generous. I would expect more from a student in our middle schools. Two years ago my daughter tried to email me because the airport that she was supposed to come back from in South America was closed due to an accident. It killed the Administer of Finance in that country. I did not get the email because I have satellite internet. I can't get anything else except dial up where I live. Okay, so every time I need to find something in Stafford County I am told to go online to get it. You need more than one square foot in the libraries if you are not going to provide essential necessities to the county residents that you are going to tax based on their land mass. I hope that you will vote no for this and send it back to the drawing board and have them redo it and try to come up with something that doesn't overwhelm our corridors that are already overwhelmed. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Betts: Hello, my name is Bonnie Betts, I live off of Garrisonville. Do I need to say my address?

Mr. Howard: No that is fine.

Ms. Betts: Okay it took me a long... I had to hustle and read this plan really fast. I had to run around like a mad woman asking different people what different things mean in the plan and I have some various questions. Things that I would like to have answered about some phrasing in the plan. But before I even ask those it is probably not important to have those answered as much as listening to the people that have been coming up here tonight talking to you, telling you that this was not a through responsibility to the community. Obviously the plan was a lot of hard work, but this plan did not engage the residents of this community like it is supposed to. You need to go back to the drawing board. I recommend involving the residents more, having more information, more input from the residents. We will be at the Supervisors meetings and we will be discussing this with them before that meeting. So I think that is probably the most important thing to do. But here is some of the things that I questioned when I ran through the plan. There is phrases like sustainable and environment, these are some categories that were the main goals. What is the distinction between sustainable and environment? I mean how are those defined and distinguished? What is the definition of equity? Why is that in there and why is that one of the goals? Why are the definitions of these not in there? That is a good question. Let's see, I saw something in there that said we need so many... twenty acres per thousand people for parks and recreations. I know we have parks, I have a son he uses those parks, I love them. I am surrounded by parks everywhere. As a matter of fact part of our gridlock is we can't have roads because, not just Quantico, but because we are surrounded by Quantico land and parks. So this twenty acres per thousand people, does that include the existing park acres? Let's see, what is the process to have an amendment made to this plan once it is approved? If it is amended, how will the public be notified? Now that is an important question, actually I would like to know that one. And why is the plan for eighty percent...eighty percent packing into in each UDA? And that is it.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Young: Hello my name is David Young. I have lived her now for... since 1987 and I live on Harpoon Drive where for the last seven or eight years I have been in either here or to the Board of Supervisors trying to fight that issue of having that Parkway going down the backside of my house. And it seems that what I thought was a dead issue has come up again. And I was not even notified that it was coming. This is the first time that I have ever been at one that I did not get some notification saying that there is going to be a discussion about that land behind your home. Mr. Garrett is very determined to have homes built back there and I would hope that you as the...as our fellow Commissioners would vote no on this particular issue. I have lived here since 1987 as I said. And how would you like to have a four lane highway going down behind your house? Already Mr. Garrett has bulldozed down the trees back there which is already caused our homes to have problems with water issue, drainage issue. And it seems like there is never an ending issue with this comp thing. I have not even had the opportunity to read it because I did not know we was going to have a new one. So I thank you for what you do but I think you should vote no and send this back.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Causey: Good evening Mr. Chairman and the Commission. My name is Skip Causey. I am a twenty six year resident in the county. I am also a business owner that is invested in our counties growth and wellbeing. I do have a couple questions based on some of the comments here today. Some people said they have never heard that we had a new comp plan coming up. This has been going on since 2006, we have been talking about it in many different forums. We had a lot of public hearing last year about this time. I did get notified, I have been reading the paper, it has been in a lot of different areas. The major thing is this is a comp plan. This is not a rezoning and everybody needs to understand that we are not automatically giving this different higher build out and/or number of residential units to anybody this is just a plan to go by. I applaud it, Stafford is growing. The whole Washington D. C. area is growing. It is in probably one of the biggest growth areas for jobs in the United States, Washington D. C. region, especially Northern Virginia. Guess what? We all applaud that every time we get new jobs in this area. We are like that is great, we want new jobs. That is one of the things being twenty five miles from Washington D. C. we tout it all the time. There comes some growth with that, we have to be prepared for that. One of the things that happens when you do no plan, or just have one area is what has been happening already. The growth goes in the wrong areas. We get gridlock, we get sprawl. We get it where we don't want it, which is out in the agricultural areas, out in the land where we do not want it. Put it near the transportation, put it near where we have the modes to handle it, isolate it. I applaud also in this plan you have more than just one. The county...the state only required one, and you have more than one. You can put it in different areas where it can be handled over time and be analyzed and be able to work not just one specific area, put everything. The plan, House Bill 71 definitely wanted to go and get the Urban Service...Urban Development Area where it could grow and be able to keep up with what is going on. A lot of people talk about the build out, the build out has never been built out. There are a lot of areas the people don't want to change their land. There are a lot of people here today that have land don't want to change it. That would be calculated in this total build out. Again this is only a guide, this is a plan this is not a rezoning. I urge you to approve the comp plan and move this over to the Board. Thank you and good night.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Smith: Good evening, my name is Rozania Smith. I get very nervous when I get (inaudible) look at me. Across from where I take the Andrew Chapel Road that is a very narrow road, very dangerous road. I do believe in progress and I do believe that Stafford needs to create job (inaudible) but I am very concerned. We were the fast county among other counties before and the builders came here and did what they did...what they want to do and left us with a lot of issues. Today I spent three hours and a half with VDOT with (inaudible) signature. They are nice to come to see me and have no solution. They agree with me but they have no solution. So we are not ready yet. The roads we have, the issues we have, so I wish you guy have somebody come in here and say I want to change the roads and make this more appealable. We cannot grow in the wrong direction, we learn the bad way. We have a high criminality right now. Not from this town, people come from other states to over here. Large townhouse bring a low income a lot of fast food. We need...does not attract people...we want to attract other people for coming here because of the land and a peaceful place to live. Now we live in very (inaudible) land, townhouses with three or five cars parked in the garage. Three or four dogs next door, I think you have got to have three acres. I am very lucky. But a lot of people are moving out, they say well I came here because it was very nice but now it is tacky. We have no driveway to walk on this road over here called Courthouse. The grass is that high. It cannot...we are in decay. So if you guys look real at that project and find a way to improve, bring something more upscale for us. We need to put your money over here. We don't have not upscale. I hate Walmart, every corner has

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Walmart. We need some more better place to be comparable to Spotsylvania, to Fairfax. We have something more different. Something you want to stay here. We don't want to go there and eat only fast food. So you guy are supposed to make this project for us and to bring us something that really make us want Stafford to go forward not backward. Schools are not good, we have no money for the schools. Roads have signs all over. Route 1 is over whelmed with signs because we have no structure. Criminality is high. Unemployment is...fast food is okay, but have to bring people more to come. More appeal to the people to come from the north. Who wants to come from the north to drive on 95 to the town....it is not good to offer. I am very sorry to try to put it that way, but I want you guys to make a decision for us. We all count on you guys to make the decision for us.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Smith: Thank you.

Ms. Heilman: Hello, my name is Wenda Heilman and I live off of Widewater in Stafford.

Mr. Howard: Can you just pull the microphone down a little.

Ms. Heilman: I am sorry.

Mr. Howard: That is okay. Thank you very much. We are starting the clock again.

Ms. Heilman: Start it. My name is Wenda Heilman and I live in Widewater...off of Widewater in Stafford County. I won't say too much because you all look very tired. I am going to keep this very brief, but I do have a couple of questions. And one of them is where will the four lane highway in Stafford Station be placed? Where will it actually be? And what if anything will be sacrificed to put it there? It might be too early for an answer for that and we are going to be anxiously awaiting to hear what is going to be done about that. And the other thing is shouldn't the people affected by the UDAs have the right to see or vote to see if they want a UDA in their area. In other words shouldn't they be able to vote? Shouldn't the people vote? I don't know I am not a lawyer, I don't know the answer to that. Does it have to be the Planning Commission, does it have to be the Board of Supervisors? Isn't it the people that count? Think about that. I would like to hear some answers to that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Heilman: And I am against it.

Ms. Oakley: Hello, you guy have been beat to death. The last time I was here was twelve years ago when my husband and I had bought a home on Ridgemoor Circle and we had...two days before or two day after we moved into the house we found out that they were talking about putting a spur off of Route 17 right through our neighborhood. And we just had our house two days. So that was the last time I had to talk to you guys.

Mr. Howard: Can you just...we will start the clock again. Can you just state your name, we did not get that.

Ms. Oakley: I am sorry.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Go ahead.

Ms. Oakley: My name is Kathy Oakley. Really I just want to explain to you what Falmouth has meant to me. I have been in Fredericksburg for twenty years and before that I lived in gobs and gobs of different places. And this is the first time since I was a child that I have been able to just stick in one place and I love it here. And I have observed a lot of things that have transpired and I have lived in a lot of big cities and I have lived in small towns and I have seen how the growth happens and how everything works. But I think one of the things that all of us, all of us need to think about is that we are not in Kansas anymore. Things are really changing and we have got to think in a different way than we have ever thought before. I want to just tell you, we have two acres and Spring Valley and because of my breathing problem I went...I got Lyme disease and I have suffered through over seven years of treatment and in bed, not being able to get up. And part of that time I had never gone down to the bottom of my property. So my niece came to visit and I was feeling pretty good and it was a nice day so she took me down to the bottom of the hill and I did not even know there was a spring down there. I mean you know Spring Valley, you would think there would be a spring, but there was actually a spring and it was really beautiful. And it was...we walked back kind of near the neighbor's property, I mean down in his little gully. And the water was about six inches deep and there were out cropping's and everything, but there was nothing living in the water. Nothing, there were no frogs, there was no moss, there was nothing. And we are not very far, if I had a good hand I could throw across Route 1 and hit the Rappahannock. And our little stream goes right down there into the river that we drink our water out of. We need to take care of business folks. We need to get down to the nitty gritty and start seeing, like they said fix what is wrong, don't build new houses. My husband and I went over to Europe a few years ago. I had never been out of the country and I am so glad I went because one of the things that I really was impressed by was that stuff was really old. You know it was really old. They did not tear stuff down, they built it up. We need to build it up.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Herr: Hi, my name is Eric Herr. I live in the Hartwood district. I will start by saying a couple things that I have not heard too much tonight and that is to thank each of you. Everyone on the Board everyone on the staff for what seems to me to be an incredible amount of hard work and diligence and dedication regardless of where you are coming at this issue from. It is obvious that people are working hard and they feel strongly about it. So that is the first thing, so thank you to each of you. Secondly I heard a lot of number before I showed up here tonight. I saw a good article in the Free Lance-Star on the 5th of November qualifying some of those numbers. I have seen one hundred and thirty thousand. I have seen three times the people moving here. Seventy thousand, ninety thousand, fourteen thousand six hundred and sixty one, which is the only number that is part of the plan, I believe. So I think a lot of people are out here tonight because they have been scared into being here. So I would just ask anyone who has seen a number to verify that number. Because I saw someone who should know better say that there are fourteen thousand homes going into Widewater and it is thirty two hundred. So people are being very loose and free and it is either because they are not that smart or they are sloppy or they are being dishonest. I don't know what it is but all these number can't be right. So I would encourage everyone to check their numbers. Secondly one of the speakers said it before and everyone (inaudible) there is a sign that says Fight Urban Sprawl and another on that just got take down that said Taxes. I don't want to see a hundred and thirty thousand new homes, I don't want to see ninety thousand, I don't want to see seventy thousand, I don't want to see thirty thousand, I don't want to see fourteen thousand six hundred and sixty one, but the reason we are where we are now is because for twenty-two years we have not had a plan. This is what you get when you don't have a plan. You get

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

lousy roads. You get curvy roads that high school students get killed on, on the way home from football games. You get gridlock in and out of developments, this is the plan. To say that if we plan we will have development is like saying if you buy life insurance you are going to die. Or you have some kind of death wish. To say you approve this plan you are in bed with the developers is saying that you know if you write a will you are in bed with the undertaker. We have got a plan for growth. The reason it is so broken now is that for twenty two years we haven't planned. I am not going to accuse every line and every word and every nuance in this plan of being perfect, but this plan is much better than anything we have had in twenty two years. I thank everyone for contributing to it and I ask everyone to continue making it better but if we don't have a plan we are going to have another twenty two years of sprawl, crawl and a way of life that I don't want to see going forward. So thanks for the time.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Dehaba: Hi, my name is Krystal Dehaba. I have lived in Stafford County for fourteen years and I recently decided to not ever move away because I like it so much. I like it because it is rural. I like it because it has a small town feel but we are close to everything that a city has. We are also close to the beach etcetera. We recently decided to build our final home in Stafford on three acres close to the Centerport UDA. And actually our property will abut that UDA and I am very displeased about that. I didn't build on three acres thinking I would have three thousand two hundred and fifteen new dwellings units right next to me. So I am very disappointed about that. But one of the main concerns I have is I am a D. C. commuter and three of these UDAs are using 95 as it's corridor for transportation for the residents. 95 is not a good transportation method for new residents, it can't even handle the residents that are currently on it. So these three UDAs that are using 95 as the corridor are not viable options and out of everything that I have heard tonight that is not anything that I have heard. So is 95 going to be widened? Is there a plan to make it a six lane on each side highway to support all the new residents that these UDAs might bring in? I don't know, but that is my number one concern. And my husband does work in Stafford County and it takes him forty five minutes just to get to work from where we live and it is kind of sad. And thank you for all of your questions that you asked tonight because I found them the most informational for me. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Knobbe: Greetings, my name is Richard Knobby. I live in Washington D. C. and I am speaking this evening for myself and my colleague Fay Carroll who unfortunately could not attend. She is from Clifton Virginia. Together we have been investors in the northern end of this county for more than three quarters of a century. In deed Mrs. Carroll grew up in Stafford and her Dad, you may be interested to know was at one time a member of your Planning Commission. His name was Howard Knapp. All this by way of saying that we have witnessed first-hand, for many, many years the slow, sluggish and spasmodic growth of Stafford County. We had attended numerous sessions of your Planning Commission. I must say it has been a very fascinating and educational experience. Personally I have learned four things. First community planning is a very interacted complicated process at best it is a guesstimated process. Secondly the draft before us has been under review for four and a half years. A very long period of time and there has been ample opportunity as we see it to have had it discussed with experts and with the community leaders. Thirdly the plan probably contains many faults and it has been suggested elsewhere that this type of plan gets reviewed every five years so there will be further opportunities to revise it. Finally I would like to say the toxin has sounded. Come September 15, 2011 twenty seven hundred federal workers are going to descend on Stafford. All I can

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

say and pray is I hope Stafford County will be ready to handle all the problems that go with that. In conclusion we see this draft plan as bold, imaginative and ambitious. We congratulate the staff and most of you on the Commission for exercising such forward looking leadership. We particularly endorse the vision of the Planning Commission so eloquently expressed on page 3-50 therein it reads, and I quote, Boswells Corner stands as the gateway from the north where the development of high quality office space and supporting retail would announce that Stafford County is an area for economic progress and not solely a bedroom community, end of quote. In this regard Mr. Chairman you may be interested in knowing that I and Mrs. Carroll and perhaps a third partner are busy seeking to assemble twenty to twenty five acres in Boswells Corner to help realize this vision. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Brito: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. I want to bring to your attention the primary goals in the existing comprehensive plan.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Brito would you just state your name and then we will start the clock again.

Mr. Brito: Okay.

Mr. Howard: I am sorry, thank you.

Mr. Brito: My name is Joe Brito. I want to bring to your attention the primary goals in the existing land use plan. I am not talking about your proposed plan I am talking about the existing plan. Goal number one, promote and provide to the fullest opportunities for commercial and industrial development. Okay when this land use plan was originally approved, large amounts of land were designated for commercial and industrial use along Route 610, Route 630, Route 1 and Route 17 and near the Stafford Airport. Now, that same land has been re-designated for residential use. That is right prime commercial land is proposed to be re-designated to allow residential use. The existing comp plan has a total of fifteen thousand two hundred and forty nine acres designated for commercial and light industrial. That is fifteen thousand two hundred and forty nine acres on the existing plan. Now the proposed plan has a total of only six thousand seventy three acres designated for commercial and light industrial use. So that is nine thousand acres of commercial and industrial land all of a sudden just disappeared. What happened to it? Well I will tell you what happened to it, your proposed plan re-designates the commercial and light industrial land to allow residential use. It is a pro-residential plan. Many meetings were held in 2006 through 2009 on the comp plan. I would say probably at least a dozen meetings. At those meetings I do not recall one person stating that we need to promote more residential growth. The theme seemed to be that we needed to promote more business growth, but now some of you are promoting a radical pro-residential growth agenda. Why are you doing this without public support? I heard a lot of speakers talk about the build out numbers. I know this Planning Commission voted to put the build out numbers in the plan but somehow you changed your mind, you did not want the public to see the build out numbers. The last build out numbers I believe were ninety one thousand and the...One of the Supervisors was quoted in the paper as saying the build out numbers were less. So anyway I am going to use a build out number, let's say seventy nine thousand residential units, okay. According to my math we currently have thirty schools with a population of forty four thousand four hundred and twenty three residential units. That is one school for every fourteen hundred and eighty three units, let's say one school for every fifteen units...ah, fifteen hundred units. If you divide the future growth...build out projection of seventy nine thousand more residential units

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

by fifteen hundred you get fifty three new schools. And fifty three new schools is basically what this plan is promoting. So I don't know how we can afford that and I guess my time is up. So thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Arndt: Sorry to be the caboose. The plates in my back don't allow me to stand up very long. I am Joyce Arndt, Widewater. Poor Widewater, everything bad comes down the pike gets stuck in Widewater first. The gateway to Stafford. My biggest concern with the plan at this point, because planning we do need and it should have been done a long time ago and the UDA idea is not a bad idea, but I think we have gone too far with it. The smaller ones, my thoughts that UDA was supposed to be residential commercial and business all working together as a unit. And I see these smaller ones that you have planned are not going to sustain business with the amount of residents that are proposed in the plan. So they are not going to work very well as a UDA. My second biggest concern is the lack of ability of the county to require developers to pay for infrastructure. Once they pay for it and put it in we have to maintain it, but we should not have to put it in if they want to make money on it. I hope you will spare Widewater this time because I think it is one of the last large areas of undeveloped ground that should be preserved particularly with its position right on the Potomac River. Even any development along there is going to be a disaster to the Chesapeake Bay system. Thank you, goodnight.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission during the public hearing may do so by stepping forward.

Mr. Faggard: I guess we saved the best for last. I had not planned on speaking this evening. I came to listen and find out what was going on. And I have been up and down the roads of Stafford County. I can remember pitching insurance...

Mr. Howard: Excuse me, could you just state your name.

Mr. Faggard: My name is Shan Faggard. I knew my name, I figured you did too.

Mr. Howard: Thank you for sharing that.

Mr. Faggard: I knew Ken did.

Mr. Howard: Alright we are going to start the clock again.

Mr. Faggard: But I have been up and down the roads of Stafford County, Culpeper, I called on mostly small business and self-employed. Mr. Boswell was one of the first people I ever called on in Stafford County. So at the time I did not know where Stafford...or where Boswells Corner was at. I just knew it had to be the last light before...after you left Quantico coming south. Since I have moved out here there is a lot more lights, a lot more traffic. And when I found out about Widewater I was really blessed. I was blessed with a piece of property I did not think I was interested in the first time I saw it. In fact I turned it down the first time I saw it, because I saw it on paper and did not go look at it. But when I did I saw something that was so pristine and such a throwback to times that when I was child growing up that I wanted my grandchildren to be part of. I think that I look at y'all's faces and I know that some of you have children and probably a few of you have grandchildren. And when you can sit on your front porch and watch the wildlife, see something that you don't see every day in Fairfax

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

County or Prince William County any more, to see their joy to see the deer and the wild animals and the pristine trees and nobody knocking it down and making it look like...well there was a song when I was a child going out...that said we took...torn down paradise and put up a parking lot. That is what I see us going to do in Widewater. I don't believe that Widewater deserves that, I don't believe the Decatur's and the old families that went out there when there was nothing, need to have anything else taken away from that way of life. And I would appreciate it if you would take Widewater out of that big growth and leave it be part...just like the Crow's Nest when we spent a bunch of money on and making it another pristine part of our County. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission during the public hearing may do so by stepping forward to the podium. Is there anyone else on my left hand side that has not addressed us that would like to do that? You can do so by stepping forward. Seeing no one advance I will now go to my right hand side. Anyone on the right that has not addressed the Planning Commission that would like to do so may do so now. Seeing no one advancing forward we will close the public hearing and bring it back to the Planning Commission. So there were several questions, I don't know if I captured all of them. Mr. Harvey, I don't know if you wrote some of them down. Maybe one we want to cover is the amendment process, so from a perspective on how the comp plan could be amended, Mr. Harvey, if you want to just quickly answer that concern that was raised.

Mr. Harvey: Yes Mr. Chairman. Anytime there is a proposed change to our county comprehensive plan whether it be the main document that we are discussing tonight or one of the sub plans of the overall document, it requires public hearing with both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Those public hearings must be advertised in a paper of general circulation for Stafford County that encompasses the Free Lance-Star. Also based on State Code we are required to post those amendments on our county web site, which we have done. And the newspaper notices have to be run twice for two consecutive weeks prior to the hearing. That is done for any amendment. Unlike a rezoning application, for the comprehensive plan amendment that's typically has much broader countywide application and we do not notify all the residents individually within the county.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. I thought some of the residents were going to stay. A group just left, but I did want to thank everyone for their participation. I thought the comments were very professional. I think there was only one person who was way out of line and we will address that at a different time. But by and large I am proud, the group was very good. I thought the comments were from the heart, very well thought out and I appreciate everybody spending the time and taking time out of your day, I mean it is almost 11:15 and everyone has been working I am sure since this morning. I certainly appreciate our citizens coming out and voicing their opinion. Mr. Harvey also can you explain the scope of the UDA consultant? That seemed to come up several times.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, the County assigned an agreement with the Virginia Department of Transportation to utilize a consultant that works on the behalf of VDOT to assist counties with developing our UDAs. This consultant that Stafford County has is also working with Spotsylvania County. The consultant works with the county for developing the location of the UDAs, standards within the UDAs as far as road network and more detailed land use planning and also helping create regulations. I know there has been some comparisons drawn to Stafford versus Spotsylvania. Spotsylvania had previously adopted their comp plan last year so they did not have UDAs in their comp plan so they were sort of starting from scratch. When we engaged this consultant we were already in the process of identifying our UDAs, so the consultant has not moved forward with that. They have been put on hold as far as designating the boundaries.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Is it fair to say it is a different scope of the engagement? So the consultant has an engagement with Stafford that is somewhat different than with Spotsylvania.

Mr. Harvey: Correct, because we are in a different place then they are presently. At least that is the tact...the direction that has been going at the present time. The UDA consultant, their work is to be concluded by the end of August at the latest for us to have adoption of more detailed UDA plans at least for one area and development regulations that might allow for construction of new projects within these UDAs completed. So we have to work with them probably through the winter and the spring and into the summer for some public hearings to try to wrap all of that up.

Mr. Howard: Okay then I think there was a comment on the military culture eroding the community and I can assure you whether it was this current version or other versions that no one has ever thought of the military eroding our community. In fact we like having Quantico where it is and there have been significant concessions in this plan based on Quantico's request. It is a huge employment epicenter for the county. It is great for the economy for the State of Virginia and it is not something that we have a desire to see go away. And I know they struggled with that, as an example in the Tidewater Region, when it appeared as so some of the counties were not as corporative and helpful with the operations with those particular bases and that we have tried, I think in a positive way to be very respectful of the military. And I think there are so many of our citizens that are either retired or current active military in some capacity that I think in some part defines who Stafford is, so I don't know if anybody else had a comment on that, but I don't want there to be confusion out there. If there was that was not the intent of that language.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, that language appears in the appendix, it talks about the results from the citizen survey.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Mr. Harvey: That would be comments that some of Stafford's citizens had raised in response to the survey that was sent out to them several years ago.

Mr. Howard: Thank you, that's great clarification actually. Then I think there was some questions about 4-19 which shows the table for road improvements. But I believe those are funded, it did not open the package, but I thought those were projects that were funded. It came up in a question about some of the road improvement for Mountain View, that is what I wrote down. So is that table...that table is projects that are currently identified and funded. Not to say those are the only projects that will occur, you know in the twenty year plan. Am I right on that? I have go to open that up.

Mr. Harvey: Correct Mr. Chairman. That is a list of projects that are in what we call approved programs. These are projects that are either going to be funded through the transportation bond program, VDOTs six year program, we have some that have been identified by federal stimulus dollars as well as transportation impact fees.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair could I get a clarification on that?

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, sure. Absolutely.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Just because they are in those approved programs, does that mean that there are existing funds allocated to them?

Mr. Harvey: Some of them do not have funding allocated at this point in time. There is a number of transportation bond projects that have not moved forward because the county has not issued bonds yet.

Mr. Howard: My point for clarification...that is a good question Ms. Kirkman. My point for this clarification was the comment that the thought was those were the only road improvements that will take place in twenty years and that in fact is not the case. I don't know if anyone else wrote anything else down. Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair I have a question for Mr. Harvey regarding the UDA consultant.

Mr. Howard: Sure.

Ms. Kirkman: So you said the UDA consultant will be drawing up some proposed legislation, like form based code sort of things?

Mr. Harvey: They will be assisting us with those types of things.

Ms. Kirkman: And then coming up with more detailed plans for one of the UDAs?

Mr. Harvey: Yes they will do an analysis of three of the UDAs based on feedback from the Planning Commission and the Board as to which UDAs you think may be more likely to develop or a higher priority in your eyes. And then they will hone down from that to look at one UDA in a more detailed plan.

Ms. Kirkman: And in the discussion you have had with people what is the thinking about that one UDA is most likely to be?

Mr. Harvey: I have not really had any discussion with anybody as far as a preference.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Then there were a lot of other comments and questions that by and large are in the document and available to be answered and not having a desire to go through the entire document to do that. I think some of it is either misconception or maybe certain portions of the document the way it is worded refer to other sections and people picked up just one portion of that and really were asking things, you know like schools came up how do they get paid for? That plan is in there and the projection of that is in there as well so without wanting to really go through the whole document, I don't know if we have the time for it tonight but if there are other questions that any of the other Commissioners heard, took notes on or would like to provide some clarification for the public this would be the time to do that. I will give everyone a minute to think through that.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Rhodes.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Rhodes: If we could just...the one element that could probably use clarification as to how it was calculated dealt with that hidden table that we are trying to hide from all public on the actual number of homes since we all know that there will really be a hundred thousand homes suddenly built here in the short future. The discussion on the maximum build out table that we at final discussion decided not to include. There was one that was included in the previous...actually approved plan, there was something similarly approved prior to that on a previous plan, but they were both calculated in different manners there is no standard there is no format but it simply had to deal with if every single piece of property in the county were developed to its maximum build out potential that is what that number that was being cited represents.

Mr. Howard: As currently zoned.

Mr. Rhodes: As currently zoned today. So if you take every single piece of property as it is currently zoned today and you were to build out, that is what that table represented. Well it was just...it is not...it does not drive anything. But there is nothing being hidden either.

Mr. Howard: Well the debate was at the Planning Commission level, should that table reflect what the comp plan would be based on the comp plan and that is...some of the number were trying to be updated and changed to that and that is where the comparison from apples to oranges came in, because those would be two different comparisons by the end of the day. The goal was to try to get the projection of this comp plan and there was not an appetite to do that. So that is why, it is not being hidden it is just the conversation was a philosophical discussion at the Planning Commission level and that is why we removed that table. Is there any other question that came up that anyone can think is not in the...because that is not in there so that would be one you would want to give clarity on, that is not contained in the plan itself or we can get to it quickly in terms of answering some of the questions.

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Yes.

Mr. Hirons: I would just address the one gentleman who actually pointed out that I have a little confusion or would like better answers on, why we are being mandated on the UDAs. Unfortunately it is the State. The answer is it is the State. Who told them? Who know, they dreamt it up but their ultimate goal is to make best resources out of the resources that the State manages, the roads, rail etcetera. In asking counties like Stafford County to do a better job of planning, I am not convenience it is the right answer, but unfortunately and the rules we live under here in the Commonwealth of Virginia requires us to listen to the State and when they ask us to do something unfortunately we are required it is not an option. So that is the short answer, I would strongly suggest you contact your State Legislators and ask them, Legislators and ask them what their plan is with it and why are these in place and what can we do to help fix these things?

Mr. Howard: Okay. Alright hearing no other questions of clarification that we want to address I will bring it back to the Planning Commission. Are there any additional questions of staff from the Commission? Okay. Well again I want to thank everyone who came tonight. It was a big crowd, it was a great crowd, very, very well done, very professional. I certainly appreciate the time and energy that you put into your comments and how you addressed us was very respectful and absolutely appreciated. Okay so now we are back at the Planning Commission. Is there any comments? Any motion? Discussion? We need a motion for discussion.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Hirons: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Hirons.

Mr. Hirons: Just trying to make sure our ducks are somewhat in a row. I do move that the Planning Commission adopt PCR10-09, which is the Resolution that has been drafted to send this comprehensive plan on to the Board of Supervisors with the recommendation of adopting the document as the Stafford County Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Howard: Is there a second?

Mrs. Hazard: Second.

Mr. Howard: Second by Mrs. Hazard. Discussion? Mr. Hirons?

Mr. Hirons: First I would like to thank everyone as the Chairman has for coming out and having your voice heard and speaking up. I encourage and hope the members of the Board of Supervisors get to see as full of a room in a few weeks when they take this up as well. And I am pretty sure that will be the case. It is really important that we as citizens participate in our government and I really appreciate everyone that has, especially the folks that we see for the most part every planning commission meeting for the last several weeks, if not several months. You guys really have put in a lot of effort. While we may not agree on certain things I for one certainly appreciate the effort that you guys put into the governance of Stafford County. Of course we won't go without thanking staff. Staff has put in a tremendous amount of work on this comprehensive plan, which will hopefully result in an approved adopted plan here within a month and perhaps Mr. Zuraf will be able to see his family again. Mike I really appreciate all the time and effort you have put into it, but I personally thank you for the time and effort you put in to helping me understand various parts of the plan as we worked through it over the last several months. Mr. Zuraf is really top notch on this comprehensive plan, the process, the knowledge, the information. Joey Hess, Mr. Hess thank you for all the time and effort you put into this as well. You have had to deal with all the numbers and spread sheets. You are definitely an excel wizard if not before you are now so we appreciate it. Mrs. Baker, thank you. Thank you for the time and effort you have put in. And of course their fearless leader Mr. Harvey, thank you for all the time you have put in. Mary, you have been here with us as well, so thank you. She has put together all the maps and such. We truly appreciate all the effort that you have done. You have done an outstanding job.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair.

Mr. Howard: Mrs. Hazard would have the second opportunity. If Mr. Hirons...

Mr. Hirons: Well let me finish up my thoughts here. I apologize. One of the things I thought of tonight or realized tonight was...just a lot of misinformation out there. This comprehensive plan, just the process, what the UDAs are, their purpose, where they come from, why they are here. Unfortunately the State tells us we have to have the UDAs. I would love to have a plan that we did not have to listen to the State as strongly as we do. And have to deal with these things. To a certain extent we may see in retrospect that they got it right. They want us to plan and maybe we were doing it right and planning correctly. Some of the sizes of these things and projected growth that is going to happen, we all hope it is less than it is. The one thing that is for certain is we live in a good area. We live in an

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

area that is rich with jobs. The economy is strong here. Here in Stafford County, here in the region. We are going to grow. I know there is a certain amount of will to never put another shovel in the ground, unfortunately that is not going to happen. We are going to grow here in Stafford County. We have got to plan appropriately. That is what I think this comprehensive plan does. It does plan appropriately. It gives us the tools that we need to accept the growth that is naturally going to happen. We could have the option of just closing our doors and say no one else can move here in Stafford County. A lot of folks tonight said how much they enjoy and love Stafford County. I grew up in Prince William County just to the north. I love Prince William County, I did not think I would enjoy moving down to Stafford County when my wife suggested it. We moved down here a few years ago and I have fallen in love with the place. I do love it. What I want to see happen is that we grow appropriately. Again I think this plan does that and I am going proudly vote in favor of this plan.

Mr. Howard: Mrs. Hazard.

Mrs. Hazard: I won't echo Mr. Hirons remarks as being a new Commissioner but I will again just say to staff thank you for the hours you have also spent with me helping me understand certain sections and just spending that extra time, taking those phone calls. You are always there and for any comments that were made in the public process that did say things I felt against staff, I would say to those that felt that way that we have an amazing planning staff in our county. And part of the reason that I am going to support this plan is I want them to do planning. I don't want them to be spending all their time working on a plan that we can't agree on. My concern is that this plan gives us a road map forward. From this plan we will create in ninety days, and I have spoken with my Chairman about that, an implementation plan of where we are to go from here. A hierarchy of what Ordinances need to be started, what things need to be done. We do not want to remain a reactive county to everything that comes before us. I would rather be a little but farther in front of the power curve each time we come...something comes to us and we need to fix it. I would like to try to fix as many things as we can. There are some things we will not be able to fix. There are some by right things that we can't fix. But I would like to be able to fix as much as we can. I view this plan as a living document. It is not intended for the plan to remain just as it is when it is adopted. One thing that the State mandates us every five years to look at it and as I believe one of the speakers or someone mentioned five years is the max for us to look at it. If we see that there is something that needs to be changed, we need to step up to the plate in two years and say we have got to look at it and we have got to amend now. I would like to give us that opportunity to do that. Also the intent is for the plan to interact with all the various situations that are going to come up. It is going to be open to change when necessary and respond to recognize challenges. In my opinion the plan should always be evolving in response to our environment. And I want to give us that chance. Is it the perfect plan? No, but no plan is ever going to be perfect in my opinion. I would say we can go on the quest for the perfect plan, but in that process we are going to miss the opportunity to plan for things that are coming and happening right in front of us. So I will be supporting the plan for those reasons and others but I will keep it to those.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Ms. Kirkman.

Ms. Kirkman: Yes Mr. Chair. I am going to make a motion to amend the primary motion. And my first motion to amend is to remove the Widewater UDA known as Stafford Station.

Mr. Fields: Second.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chairman I made the motion to amend because...

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, can I get clarification on your motion?

Ms. Kirkman: Yes.

Mr. Howard: So you are amending the motion or you are changing the motion? You are substituting the motion?

Ms. Kirkman: I am amending the primary motion.

Mr. Howard: So the primary motion is for approval.

Ms. Kirkman: Yes.

Mr. Howard: So you would...you are saying you will...you are moving towards approval without the Widewater UDA. Is that what you...

Ms. Kirkman: I am not taking a position on that. What I am doing...

Mr. Howard: No that is the motion.

Ms. Kirkman: The motion is to...

Mr. Howard: You may vote against it of course, but your motion...

Ms. Kirkman: I don't have to state my position on the primary motion at this time.

Mr. Howard: I am not asking you too.

Ms. Kirkman: Good, but my motion is to amend the primary motion.

Mr. Howard: Which I am just clarifying, okay?

Ms. Kirkman: Umhummm.

Mr. Howard: The primary motion is to move forward with the comp plan, recommend it to the Board of Supervisors. You're making an amendment which keeps the primary motion intact, but you are changing the portion where the Widewater UDA would be included.

Ms. Kirkman: That is correct.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Just so everyone knows that is what...

Ms. Kirkman: It is a primary...an amendment to the primary motion. It is not a substitute motion.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: And the reason why I made that is because the Widewater UDA is not smart growth. It is just more growth. It is built in green space there is no transportation infrastructure whatsoever.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

There are no public facilities. The citizens of Widewater have repeatedly now for decades spoken against building a city on the Widewater peninsula. So that is why I made this motion for an amendment.

Mr. Howard: Okay, Mr. Fields.

Mr. Fields: Well I am supporting that as I would support a number of amendments and changes to this plan. If you have...this is...what we have going on here in Widewater and I will add probably my support is for a similar reason in the George Washington district, is relatively unprecedented when I talked to the people that have been around if Stafford politics and local politics in general for a long time. We all have disagreements, we all have different visions, we are elected by different groups of citizens to represent different parts of the county, and different parts of the county have different views of the future of the county given their nature. That has only been more dramatic over the years it has not been less dramatic. One of the...one of the principals that has always applied is that whether you agree with a Supervisor or Planning Commissioner or not, if that elected official of that region and their appointed official, the Planning Commissioner, having you know not just made this stuff up but talked to thousands of people can tell you and sit here over and over and tell you that the citizens of that district do not want this plan. Yet a majority of these bodies continue to force that down the citizens that is a serious, serious abrogation of the process of trust and respect that this whole system works on. And to have Mr. Woodson and Ms. Kirkman and the citizens of Widewater soundly articulate their unswerving opposition to this giant UDA in Widewater and never the less to recommend its approval is beyond the payoff. It is without precedent in this county and it is a very, very, very, sad precedent.

Mr. Howard: Further discussion. Mr. Rhodes or Mr. Mitchell you have not had a chance to talk yet.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you Mr. Chairman. First and foremost I just wanted to, as others have, thank the staff. Having started off on this journey with them, being the first of three different sub-committees and groups to try and work this thing forward and having failed miserably but spent a year and a half of Mike Zuraf's and other folks time in the process. I just wanted to thank you tremendously. And I would echo the comments that we have a phenomenal staff and this county is tremendously blessed with the planning staff that they have. There was an individual that was frustrated for some reason on the presentation, I will tell you I thought it was an amazing presentation to take three hundred and twenty pages of a document that was built over five years and hundreds and hundreds of meetings and inputs of hundreds and hundreds of people and be able to present it that way, I thought it was a tremendous job. So I want to thank you. While there are many conspiracy theories about different motivations that are here, I have seen nothing but folks, many folks who are just tremendously interested in this county and trying to figure out how to take it forward. There is not a, as Mrs. Hazard mentioned, there is not a perfect plan and this is not a perfect plan. Quite frankly Widewater is the one piece that I really have not felt the most comfortable with in here either. I will actually support the amended motion of moving it forward without that because that is probably the one element that I was least comfortable with out of this eighty five or ninety percent solution. With that said we do live in a Dillon Rule State, we do live in a State that unless they tell specifically we have the authority, we don't have the authority. So there are many things we can't control and we are further behind than we would like to be on infrastructure. It is going to take us forever to catch up. But as we go forward with whatever plan we end up pushing forward and whatever plan the Board of Supervisors implements there is nothing more important, quite frankly than insuring that we stay on top of it, insuring that we track it along the way. Insuring that we have a process every year going along to see how far we are in

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

that process how well it is coming close to the assumptions because none of the assumptions are going to be perfect. How close are we on those assumptions and insuring that at the five year point we make the appropriate meaningful adjustments to this comprehensive plan. To keep it a solid road map going forward. I thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, as most of you know I served on the 2008-2009 Comprehensive Subcommittee Plan with Ms. Kirkman and Mr. Di Peppe. We met numerous weeks, we met numerous nights. These were all afternoon meeting, they were no Saturday meetings. These were meeting that happened six thirty or seven at night. Most people that work up north could even get down here by seven thirty. Then I served on the 2010 with Ms. Hazard and Mr. Hiron. Again all of these were advertised on the internet. They were advertised in the newspaper. There were no hidden meetings. We met every Thursday for months and months and months. These were advertised meetings nothing was hid at any point. Most I ever saw was probably three people, citizens, sometimes two, the majority of the time zero. I am not counting county staff or the three members of the subcommittee. But we met months and months and months. This was nothing hidden. This was not an agenda where people were not allowed to come and did not have knowledge of it. The knowledge was in the newspaper and on the county website. We had to advertise it, if we changed it we had to advertise it and let people know. I like many others have said here is it a perfect plan? The answer is no. If her were alive today you could ask General Dwight David Eisenhower when he planned D Day was it the perfect plan? He would have to tell you no. Did it work in the final facets of it? Yes. Were things changed? Yes. Were things revamped? Yes. So this has been a tremendous struggle. Mr. Fields were standing four and a half years ago up on the second floor and we filled the room with people, citizens concerned. We filled the room with the consultant we filled the room with the people that were involved. This is four and a half years in the making. It has come a long way it has seen tremendous change it has seen tremendous effect. Again it is not cast in stone and again it will be looked at. So four and a half years later we need to make a move on it. Make it work somehow. Make it change somehow. So again is it perfect? No. Is it workable? Yes. Thank you sir.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chairman. Just a point of order, I believe at this point we were supposed to be debating the merits of the amendment rather than the primary motion.

Mr. Howard: Well you amended the primary motion and changed or added language to it so I believe, we can ask the Parliamentarian, but my understanding is that we can debate the primary and the amended language. Is that correct?

Mr. Smith: Yes Mr. Chairman. I think it is in order to debate both the primary motion and the proposed amendment.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Ms. Kirkman. As a point of order I am going to step down as Chair and hand the gavel over to Mr. Fields for a moment. And I am making an amendment of the second degree to amend Ms. Kirkman's amendment and reinstate the Widewater UDA into the Comp Plan.

Mr. Mitchell: I second that.

Mr. Howard: That has to be seconded, right?

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, point of order. That motion can be dealt with by voting on the first amendment, at which point that makes your motion moot and therefore out of order. So, if it were something entirely different it would be a different case. But that's not what you've done...

Mr. Howard: Well, we'll check with the Parliamentarian. I'll take the gavel back now since the motion's been seconded.

Ms. Kirkman: You know, it might just be quicker to vote on the amendment of the motion, and then move on since we already know what the vote's going to be.

Mr. Howard: Well, the interesting thing, Ms. Kirkman, and we can have Mr. Smith answer this, is... if he can because I pulled it out of a spot, I'm not sure he's going to be able to find it... the way you amended the motion we certainly could vote whichever way you vote, but if it turned out that it didn't advance, the piece that could get complex is bringing the same motion back onto the table. So, making the amendment to your amendment, actually there can't be a third one to that. So you can't change, once you make a secondary amendment, you can't change; there's no way to do a third amendment. So I don't believe it makes my motion moot.

Ms. Kirkman: While it is true under Roberts Rules of Order you cannot have more than two amendments to a primary motion on the table at the same time, you cannot make any motion which deals, which is dealt with by a motion that is made before it. And by voting on my amendment, you will be dealing with the motion that you have made.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman? My concern and I guess a question to the Parliamentarian or whomever is if we don't vote in the affirmative to Ms. Kirkman's... if her motion with the amendment was on the table, we are then not voting for the Comp Plan...

Ms. Kirkman: That's correct.

Mr. Rhodes: So if we want to vote for the Comp Plan, the way I understand it, where it stands before your second amendment, is you have to vote for it without the Widewater. So, I'm not sure you can vote for the Comp Plan and deal with her amendment. I'm not sure how you can do both in the same fashion.

Mr. Howard: Well, I guess my understanding was she amended the motion...

Ms. Kirkman: Right.

Mr. Howard: It was not a substitute motion.

Mr. Rhodes: Correct.

Ms. Kirkman: That's right. Mr. Chair, my understanding is the body votes on whether or not they are going to pass the amendment. If the amendment fails at that point, if there are no other amendments made, you can move on...

Mr. Howard: If Mr. Smith agrees with that, I will withdraw...

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Chairman, because I understood we were voting on the overall motion with the amendment.

Ms. Kirkman: The amendment was never passed.

Mr. Howard: Well, let's find out from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. Smith: I think I need some clarity to begin with then. The amendment, what was the nature of an amendment if it wasn't a substitute because there can be various forms of an amendment? And that may influence what happens.

Ms. Kirkman: The amendment was to remove the Widewater UDA from the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Smith: Okay. And if it wasn't in the nature of a substitute as an amendment, an amendment can encompass a number of different sub-motions and that's where I'm trying to get some additional clarity to determine what the appropriate...

Ms. Kirkman: My motion was to amend the primary motion by removing the Widewater... the primary motion is to pass the Comprehensive Plan as it exists. My motion is to amend that primary motion by removing the Widewater UDA from the Comprehensive Plan. In the past, the way this body has dealt with motions to amend is to first vote on the motion to amend. If that motion to amend fails, then the body has gone on to vote on the primary motion. If it passes, then our body has gone on to vote on the primary motion with the amendment. That's the way we've done it in the past.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, I've not known that we've done a vote on an amendment so I don't know that we've done it in the past. So that often is declared by one person's opinion as to what we do. I don't know that we've done that so I would just like clarity. My understanding was she made an amendment to the motion which meant we would be voting on the entire motion to include with that modification to it. So, I just want clarity as to where we're at.

Mr. Smith: Ms. Kirkman, thank you for the additional information. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a moment for me to examine the rules and try to give you your request. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, that's a great idea. Thank you. So, we used this word before; we're going to stand at ease which means we stay put and there's no discussion. Mr. Smith, if you have Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Order, if you go to page 125 and it's around number 15. Amend is probably the most widely used of the subsidiary motions. Its adoption does not adopt the motion thereby amended. That motion remains pending in its modified form. Rejection of a motion to amend leaves the pending motion worded as it was before the amendment was offered. Which is what I think Ms. Kirkman indicated, if she made that type of a motion.

Mr. Smith: Yes, I think that's my understanding of Ms. Kirkman's motion.

Mr. Howard: So, here's the gavel. I will withdraw my secondary amendment. Does the seconder agree with that?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Okay. We're back to discussion and we are voting on the amended wording to the primary motion. So that's... we'll call the vote. All those in favor of Ms. Kirkman's amendment to the primary motion signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Opposed say nay.

Mrs. Hazard: Nay.

Mr. Mitchell: Nay.

Mr. Hirons: Nay.

Mr. Howard: Nay. Motion did not carry 4 to 3. And we're back to the primary motion.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, just for the record I'm going to make one more motion to amend of the same sort I just did. And that is to remove the Brooke UDA from the Comprehensive Plan, and again, for the same reasons. That is a little island in a sea of green. It is out in the rural area, no infrastructure. So I'm making that motion to amend for the same reasons as I did with the Widewater.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Fields: Second.

Mr. Howard: There's a second. Discussion; Ms. Kirkman? You discussed it, okay. Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: Well, I couldn't agree more. I think we've seen it... that concept, having a rail line through Stafford makes us want to utilize it and I can respect that intent. The sad truth is that the non-existent Widewater and the completely rural Brooke are completely inappropriate to utilize in that way. You're just using rail lines; you're not solving sprawl, you're creating sprawl.

Mr. Howard: Any other discussion on that amendment? Okay, hearing none I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of Ms. Kirkman's amendment please signify by saying aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Opposed nay.

Mr. Rhodes: No.

Mrs. Hazard: Nay.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Mitchell: Nay.

Mr. Hirons: Nay.

Mr. Howard: Nay. Motion did not carry 5 to 2. Okay, now we are truly back to the primary motion. I think everyone had a chance to speak other than myself, is that correct?

Mr. Fields: Actually I haven't spoken to the primary motion.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: Neither have I Mr. Chair.

Mr. Howard: Right, you made a substitute motion. Alright, so go ahead Mr. Fields.

Mr. Fields: Well, I will not be supporting this motion. Reasons are numerous and it's late. I will be succinct. To use land use to solve the problems of sprawl, there's really only in large picture one possible solution, that's collating jobs and where people live. Collating other things is helpful, collating where people work and live is the only alternative to sprawl. The opportunities, back in 2005, everybody says 2006. This process started in 2005 when I was on the Board. There were three things, it was very clear. We articulated that as a Board. There were three things on the horizon that you could do to change the trajectory of a County like Stafford that has a staggering amount of vested zoning already. Remember, with the vested zoning, you don't have the opportunity to change much. We had the opportunity to do three things: you could downzone the rural areas to change the build-out of the A-1 areas by whatever change you made to it, by a third if you went from three acres to ten acres as the minimum by-right lot. You had the ability with 3202 and that was introduced to charge comprehensive impact fees to cover the full cost of all building, including by-right as well as future zonings. For numerous reasons the Board of Supervisors chose not to do that. You had the third option which was to retract to the maximum extent practicable the extension of water and sewer, specifically sewer, to areas where you did not want growth. And this we had achieved something like that at the end of the 2008 plan. It's been reversed and eroded ever since and now we have a plan that extends it out into George Washington and out into Widewater. The Widewater extension became clear when the UDA placed to accommodate that specific development proposal was extended. I was mystified about the adamancy of my colleagues to extend the George Washington water and sewer past was Mr. Crisp and I and the citizens of George Washington wanted until, of course, we've seen the Walton Group notice in the paper today, the major international development group that's going to buy up that property where that water line is and sewer line is, with a very confident belief that they are going to be able 1,200 acres there even though it's not designated for that in the Comp Plan and even though it's outside the Urban Services Area. So, with that, we've got a plan that extends water and sewer far outside the... the sewers was the last line of defense. So, this plan, the evolution of this plan has missed the three possible opportunities to positively affect the future of Stafford. It does nothing but accommodate... I wish I could say in general it accommodated the development industry... it accommodates the concept of multiple property rights and the ability of anybody to make money developing, it accommodates a handful of corporate developers who control most of the UDA properties and the property in George Washington. So in my opinion it's a travesty of public interest and the actions of everybody involved will not be forgotten by the citizens of the George Washington District I can guarantee you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: I also will be voting against the motion to move this Comprehensive Plan forward. This plan is simply a green light for urbanizing Stafford County. The citizens have made it clear that they do not want this. In fact, tonight they spoke out eight to one in opposition to this plan. We're here to represent the interests of citizens. Supervisor Woodson and myself have objected repeatedly to the inclusion of Widewater in the Urban Development Area and extending water and sewer to the Widewater Peninsula. And yet this is being jammed down our throats anyway and we have to ask why is that. Mr. Woodson, Supervisor Woodson, who nominated me to this position on the Planning Commission, refused to accept contributions from developers during his campaign.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, I'm not sure where it's going to go but it has to be germane to the motion.

Ms. Kirkman: Yes, Mr. Chair, and it is germane to the motion. I am speaking to the reasons for my opposition to this. And unlike Mr. Woodson, the five Republican Supervisors on the Board and the Republican Party have accepted large campaign donations from developers.

Mr. Howard: Ms. Kirkman, that's not germane to the... it may be an opinion that you have...

Mr. Fields: It's a fact where the money comes from, it's real germane (inaudible).

Ms. Kirkman: It's a fact, it's a matter of public record.

Mr. Howard: Point of order, point of order. Knock it off please. Let's keep ourselves whole.

Ms. Kirkman: So, I think the citizens can look at who's contributing to the campaigns and make up their own minds about why people are listening to who they are. I'm here tonight to listen to the citizens who are against this plan and that's why I am opposing it.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. I'm going to support the plan. I don't think the plan is a hundred percent; I think that's been said. I still think it's an eighty-five percent solution and I'm not sure you can get to a hundred percent. There's been a lot of effort and work including by those who are opposing the plan today, there's probably fifty percent of their work that has remained intact in this Comprehensive Plan. It's been a long drawn out process. It's been a good process for the County; it will continue to be a process as this moves forward. It will continue to evolve. It's a Comprehensive Plan that's used as a guide, it's not gospel. Yes, it does give some latitude to developers to allow them to seek out certain types of development, but at the same time when we get the new proffer process in place and we go through some of the new zoning and ordinances that will follow, as well as working with the UDA consultant to help us design up to three of those UDAs with the greatest, latest technology and information available in terms of transportation I think will be a positive. I think when we stoop to a level of making accusations, that's unfortunate and I wish that did not happen this evening. It did happen; I can't take that back, but I can tell you that my experience is that happens when people really don't have a good answer or a good rebuttal to what the plan is. We've heard quite a bit about you can't put it here, you can't put it there. Well, where can you put it? At the end of the day we're required by the State Legislature to comply with the UDA law that's in Virginia and that's what we're attempting to do. And it's a good plan. You saw the maps, you saw the different renderings and we certainly want to be respectful of Quantico. We're not looking to see that base leave Stafford, Prince William County anytime soon. And that is what it is. And it's a plan, it's a guide, and I'm looking

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

forward to casting my vote for this in favor of it. And again, I want to thank everyone who's worked on this and I'll be short because I want to be done before midnight.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman? We had a point earlier in the presentation by staff that indicated that there was a little bit of a disconnect between the text language and the... the narrative rather... and the map especially as deals with the green areas that should be qualified on the maps as agricultural/rural. I don't know if the motion then picks that up or do we require an amendment first before we vote on the overall...

Mr. Howard: No, the current motion on the table doesn't pick that up.

Mr. Rhodes: Then I'd like to make an amendment to the motion and deal with the vote on that particularly...

Mr. Hirons: And can it be accepted as a friendly amendment?

Mr. Howard: That is the way we've conducted business in the past.

Mr. Rhodes: If the motioner would consider as an amendment to their motion, and the seconder would, to ensure that the maps represent that the green areas are both agricultural/rural so that it will match the narrative in the text, I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. Howard: Do you accept that?

Mr. Hirons: Absolutely.

Mr. Howard: Secunder?

Mrs. Hazard: Yep.

Mr. Howard: Alright, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of the motion on the table signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed nay?

Mr. Fields: Nay.

Ms. Kirkman: Nay.

Mr. Howard: The motion carries 5 to 2. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
November 17, 2010

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Moved after item 1.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:59 p.m.

Gordon Howard, Chairman
Planning Commission